AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of Minutes of December 7, 2016
4. Report of Nominating Committee and Election of Officers
5. Executive Director’s Report
6. Presentation: Looking back at 2016, Looking ahead to 2017
   BCPC Staff
7. Act 247 Reviews
8. Old Business
9. New Business
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment

Please remember to contact us at
215-345-3400 if you cannot attend. Thank you.

AGENDA SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO MEETING
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
December 7, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: James J. Dowling; Raymond (Skip) W. Goodnoe; Edward Kisselback, Jr.; David R. Nyman; Robert M. Pellegrino; Carol A. Pierce; R. Tyler Tomlinson; Walter S. Wydro

STAFF PRESENT: Lynn T. Bush; Donna W. Byers; Debra Canale; David P. Johnson; Timothy A. Koehler, Charles T. McIlhinney; Margaret A. McKevitt; Michael A. Roedig; David A. Sebastian; Maureen Wheatley

GUESTS: Brian Hessenthaler, Chief Operating Officer, County of Bucks
Larry Menkes, Warminster Resident

1. CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Wydro called the meeting to order at 2:05 PM. Mr. Wydro congratulated the staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission on the wonderful job they do every day of servicing the planning needs of Bucks County. Their devotion shows in each of the completed projects and continued program growth, such as the trails and the protection of our farmland and natural resources.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

Mr. Kisselback recognized the anniversary of the bombing of Pearl Harbor and called for a moment of silence. He also announced a photograph would be taken of the board at the conclusion of the meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING, NOVEMBER 2, 2016
Upon motion of Mr. Dowling, seconded by Mr. Nyman, with the vote being 8-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the November 2, 2016 meeting as presented.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
The Executive Director’s Report was submitted to the board prior to the meeting. Ms. Bush noted the confusion concerning the conclusion of the Open Space Municipal Grant Program. The original deadline for the program was December 31, 2014. The Commissioners extended this deadline to December 30, 2016. All municipalities with money remaining have been reminded that the extended deadline is this month. The Farmland Preservation Program, which started before the Open Space Grant Program, will continue preserving farmland throughout the county.

Ms. Bush spoke about the County Commissioners Association meeting that she attended, along with Mr. Hessenthaler, and Commissioners Loughery and Martin. There were discussions concerning the failure of the electronics recycling act to deal with old electronics, budget concerns and the growing heroin epidemic.

Ms. Bush told us that the Cross Keys Study has been completed and they will be meeting with the four municipalities involved in January. But there are many things happening in that area, such as
the Cross Keys office building, now acquired by Doylestown Hospital for an urgent care center. There is activity on the former Anthony-Sylvan Pools site, the Biotechnology Center is expanding, and the municipalities (especially Buckingham) are interested in ordinance changes to accommodate our ideas for the area.

Ms. Pierce spoke about the Old Conti restaurant in the Cross Keys area and the potential for it to become a Bucks County Visitors Center. It was noted that the connectivity to surrounding shops and auto dealers in the area is lacking and needs to be addressed. Mr. Sebastian stated that the connectivity has been proposed in the Cross Keys Study.

Ms. Bush addressed the BCPC Activity Report, highlighting the studies and plans the staff is working on for numerous municipalities, such as the New Britain Borough’s Comprehensive Plan, Richboro Village Master Plan, Dublin Borough’s zoning and subdivision and land development amendments, and Morrisville Borough’s MEDI project.

Ms. Bush noted that November 16th was National Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Day, which was noted at the Commissioners’ meeting. GIS started here at the BCPC but is now widely used for 9-1-1, Health Department, Board of Assessment, Emergency Management, Board of Elections, and the municipalities. Mr. Nyman stated that the staff’s willingness to extend themselves to other departments has exponentially expanded the value of GIS to the county and its residents.

Ms. Bush also stated that the Trails Program is forging ahead with the next trail to begin being the Neshaminy Greenway Trail which will connect Central Park in Doylestown with the Neshaminy Manor Nursing Home in Warrington.

The board thanked Ms. Bush for her report.

5. **PRESENTATION: 65 YEARS OF BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING** – LYNN T. BUSH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Ms. Bush directed our attention to the many displays around the room showing a number of Bucks County Planning Commission projects, important news reports, pictures and plans. She gave an in-depth presentation of the many interesting projects, plans and people of the last 65 years of the Bucks County Planning Commission. Please see the attached presentation (Exhibit A).

Ms. Bush stated that the for the most part, the Bucks County Planning Commission’s vision has remained the same since Franklin C. Wood, our first Executive Director, gave the statement, “Our goal is to provide the best possible planning assistance through a variety of techniques that will enhance the quality of life in our Bucks County communities. The County hopes to avoid the cropping up of blighted areas, the unwise location of homes and industrial plants, and the road congestion that so often follows rapid development. It is hoped that the most desirable locations will be selected for new schools and other public buildings while maintaining the county’s original beauty, its historical significance, and its agricultural productivity which is so vital to the economy of this area”.

Ms. Bush stated that the Planning Commission protects the places that make Bucks County, Bucks County. The quality of life for Bucks County residents, where they live, where they work, where their children go to school, where they play and where they go when they age, every plan or project
we do here is done with these factors in mind.

The board thanked Ms. Bush for her wonderful presentation.

6. **Act 247 Reviews**
   The reviews of December 7, 2016, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Pellegrino, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the motion carried to approve the December 7, 2016 Act 247 reviews.

7. **Old Business**
   There was no old business.

8. **New Business**
   Ms. Pierce announced that the BCPC Nominating Committee will be Mr. Dowling, Mr. Goodnoe and Ms. Pierce. They will submit their report at the next meeting.

9. **Public Comment**
   Mr. Menkes commented on the need for bicycle lanes in Warminster and public transportation within Bucks County and especially Warminster.

10. **Adjournment**
    By motion of Mr. Nyman and seconded by Mr. Dowling, Mr. Wydro adjourned the meeting at 2:50 PM.

    Submitted by:
    Debra Canale, Staff Secretary
The Metropolitan Caucus – Elected officials from the five southeast Pennsylvania counties met at the Pennsylvania Society. The group will be reassembled in 2017, now that Mayor Kinney is on board, and potential topics for joint projects are:

- Mental health/drug abuse and prisons
- Prisoner re-entry
- Infrastructure finance
- Emergency management
- Workforce development.

SEPTA’s State of the Budget Meeting – We meet annually with SEPTA to review their proposed capital budget, which for the coming year includes the advancement of their new Pay system, called the “Key” system, acquiring new vehicles, leases with Amtrak, catenary and substation replacements, bridge repairs, an extension of service from Elwyn to Wawa, Lansdale station improvements, the Levittown station rebuilding, and downtown station improvements. They will be acquiring double decker cars to run on the West Trenton Line as part of I95 congestion reduction.

Bristol Township Market & Economic Feasibility Analysis (RFP) – We are seeking an economic consulting firm to help us project what the future economic conditions will be in lower Bucks County as the result of the I95-PA Turnpike connection. We hosted a pre-proposal meeting for potential bidders.

Gaming Funds – The Bucks County Redevelopment Authority awarded $3.5 million in gaming grants to the six municipalities eligible to apply for gaming funds generated at Parx Casino. The County of Bucks was awarded $858,171:

- Lower Bucks Training Center - $512,066
- BCHIP - $125,000
- Bucks County Police Association Forensic Science, DNA Project - $221,105
BCPC Activity Report

Community Planning and Municipal Economic Development Initiative

The Planning Commission staff helps townships and boroughs in several ways: we attend local planning commissioner meetings to provide advice and guidance, and we prepare plans and ordinances in cooperation with local representatives. We are in our fourth year of providing municipal assistance through the Municipal Economic Development Initiative (MEDI), and several of the activities below are in that category and are so noted.

We attended the Hilltown and Milford townships and New Britain Borough Planning Commission meetings and the Quakertown Area Planning Committee (QAPC) monthly meeting.

Preparing Plans – The New Britain Borough Council adopted the New Britain Borough Main Street Plan (part of our MEDI program) at their December meeting. Council will act on the plan at December’s Council meeting. Production also continued on the update to the Borough’s Comprehensive Plan.

Review comments were received from the borough’s engineer, planner, and solicitor regarding Dublin Borough’s draft zoning and subdivision and land development ordinance amendments. In January, we will reconvene with the borough’s Planning Commission to address these comments.

Work continued on the Morrisville Borough MEDI project. Staff is developing photo simulations of potential downtown improvements and designs, as well as evaluating concepts and designs for Williamson Park.

The staff is waiting for additional information from Quakertown Borough’s Economic Development Consultant in order to finalize revisions to the draft Quakertown Borough—Summary of Parking Inventory.

We started work on a revitalization study for Tullytown Borough. The new train station may spark redevelopment and bring new tax revenue to replace that to be lost by closure of the landfill.

In addition to special studies and plans, we continue to prepare, under contract, Comprehensive Plans for Northampton Township, Lower Makefield Township, Hilltown Township and Warrington Township.

Staff finalized the Plumstead Township Master Trail Plan and presented the plan for adoption to the township Board of Supervisors.

Providing Planning Information and Coordinating with other Agencies

The planning commission staff provides information and assistance to the many people who call us for help. This includes topics such as demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, BCPC reports, local zoning, and municipal regulations. Some of this work results from our mandated functions (reviewing proposed developments and reviewing various permit applications), some from other groups that need information, and some from residents who need guidance.
Transportation and Trails

BCPC Transportation Planning staff is responsible for working with PennDOT, DVRPC, SEPTA, TMA Bucks, and other groups to ensure that our transportation and funding needs are addressed. We work closely with public transportation providers, such as SEPTA. This month, we met with SEPTA Capital Budget representatives to discuss the draft SEPTA Capital Budget for FY2017.

The County is pursuing three trail development initiatives. The Upper Bucks Rail Trail will connect the Lehigh Valley’s Saucon Rail Trail with the borough of Quakertown by converting a currently unused portion of SEPTA rail line to a trail through Springfield and Richland townships. Staff continued to work with the municipalities and project consultant regarding wetland issues and traffic signalization permits for road crossings. The County has hired a firm to design the Newtown Rail Trail for the Upper Southampton Township section. The current project will construct the portion of the Newtown Rail Trail in Upper Southampton Township and will connect with the Pennypack Trail in Montgomery County. Staff facilitated a meeting between Upper Southampton Township and the consultant to finalize outstanding issues. We also developed the Request for Proposals for the Neshaminy Greenway Trail, a Congestion Management Air Quality Program-funded trail that will connect Doylestown’s Central Park with the county facilities in the Neshaminy Manor Complex. We conducted a mandatory pre-proposal meeting with all prospective consultants to discuss the RFP and its requirements. All of these trails are part of the Circuit, which is envisioned as a 750-mile regional trail network.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

GIS has become a central function in Bucks County government, with our GIS staff providing the overall management for a system that involves not only BCPC but also Emergency Communications and 9-1-1, Board of Assessment, Health Departments, and others. We help to keep the county tax map parcel records and road centerlines updated.

The GIS data is increasingly used by people outside the county, either through our very popular public viewer, or through our GIS Consortium of municipalities.

Updates of GIS data are always provided to our Consortium members when requested. County GIS is finalizing development of a GIS Open Data Portal web site that when completed members will be able to access their municipal data sets for both downloading and mapping. This month we provided updates to both Warwick and Warrington Townships.

We have added some new search functions and widgets to our Public GIS Viewer which should be available in January 2017.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Shared Services GIS project is a collaborative effort of the counties of Bucks, Berks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and the City of Philadelphia. The group meets monthly and is currently utilizing a cloud hosted infrastructure that supports a centralized and shared regional GIS database. In addition the group has finalized an agreement to acquire aerial imagery from Pictometry. A 2017 spring flight is planned with delivery late in summer. There was no meeting of the group scheduled for December.

Act 247 and 537 Review Activity
13 Subdivision and Land Development Proposal
  3 Sketch Plans
  9 Municipal Plans and Ordinances
  3 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
  2 Traffic Impact Studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>8-16-4</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Off Street Parking for Dwelling in Combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Township</td>
<td>9-16-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Sign Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulmeville Borough</td>
<td>16-16-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield Township</td>
<td>20-16-CR1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>(20-16-1-1 &amp; -2)</td>
<td>County Review: Athletic Field Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>26-16-4</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Borough</td>
<td>28-16-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solebury Township</td>
<td>41-16-ASA1</td>
<td>Temple Partners II, LP</td>
<td>(41-1-29; 41-1-29-1, 2; 41-13-25-3; 41-2-76-3)</td>
<td>ASA Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Makefield Township</td>
<td>47-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Topsoil Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>48-16-5</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Medical Marijuana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Borough Council
   Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Off-Street Parking for Use 11, Dwelling in Combination

Applicant: Borough Council
Received: December 27, 2016
Hearing Date: January 23, 2017

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 4, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Section 801.3 of the borough zoning ordinance to add a new subsection (3.a.) under the residential off-street parking requirement to require two spaces per dwelling unit, plus one space for every 400 square feet devoted to non-residential patron use; or two spaces per dwelling unit plus one space for each five (5) seats, whichever is greater for Use 11, Dwelling in Combination.

COMMENTS

The proposed amendment appears to be consistent with the ordinance amendment procedures as prescribed in Section 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we recommend that the borough adopt the proposed revisions.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

MMW:dc

cc: Jordan Yeager, Esq., Curtin & Heefner, Borough Solicitor
    Karyn Hyland, Borough Director of Building and Zoning
    John Davis, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors
    Doylestown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Sign Regulations

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: November 23, 2016
Hearing Date: January 17, 2017

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 4, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance (Chapter 175) to provide more comprehensive regulations for temporary and permanent signs in the township.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Section 175-16H(5) of the zoning ordinance, pertaining to Use H-5 Temporary uses, structures, and vehicles, will be amended to include temporary signs that are utilized for a specified duration during new construction, renovation, reconstruction, or other special circumstances of a nonrecurring nature, such as fires and acts of nature. This use will be specifically permitted in all zoning districts, provided that the primary use is permitted in the subject zoning district. The proposed amendment specifies that any extension of a permit for Use H-5 beyond a two-year period will require approval by the zoning officer or Board of Supervisors. Also, signage related to Use H-5 will be subject to the sign regulations in Article XX.

Article XX, Signs, will include substantial amendments including:

- a new section on terms and definitions related to signage
- minor revisions to the prohibited signs section, including:
  - specific exclusion of off-premise, outdoor advertising signs
  - inclusion of mobile billboards, if they are parked in such a manner that their primary purpose is for advertising
- minor revisions to the exempt signs section, including:
  - inclusion of incidental signs, provided they do not advertise any commercial establishment, activity, organization, product, or services
- a maximum area requirement of 2 square feet for cornerstone, historic plaques or signs affixed to the surface of a building
- limiting directional signs to a maximum area of 4 square feet, a maximum height of 5 feet, and no illumination

- revisions to the general sign section, including:
  - additional locational setbacks for signs adjacent to multi-use trails and public or private sidewalks
  - the methods in which sign height is measured (including diagrams)
  - specific requirements related to illumination of signs
  - diagrams showing how sign area is calculated
  - exclusion of temporary signs in the calculation of the number of signs permitted on a property

- a new section that provides regulations on sign types including:
  - building (mounted) signs – wall signs, canopy or awning signs, projecting signs, window signs, marquee signs
  - freestanding signs
  - electronic message center signs
  - street pole banners
  - temporary construction signs in conjunction with Use H5

- new sections covering specific requirements for signs in the township’s residential, institutional, commercial, industrial, commercial retirement, and village center zoning districts (including reference charts showing required maximum area, maximum number, duration for temporary signs, and maximum height)

- revisions to the section on removal of unlawful, unsafe, and abandoned signs

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposed amendment is intended to provide more comprehensive regulations for temporary and permanent signs. Prior to adoption, we recommend that township officials consider the following comments:

1. **Height of residential signs**—Proposed Sections 175-111.B(1)[c] and 175-111.B(2)[c] permit a maximum height of 6 feet for permanent and temporary signs for residential uses. Proposed Section 175-111.C(3) permits a maximum height of 8 feet for signs for residential developments containing more than 10 units. Similarly, proposed Section 175-114.B(1)[c] and 175-114.B(2)[c] permit a maximum height of 6 feet for permanent and temporary signs for residential uses. These maximum heights seem excessive and may be obtrusive in a residential setting.

2. **Building sign height in Institutional District**
   
   a. **Temporary sign**—Proposed Section 175-112.C(2)[c], related to building signs, states that temporary signs shall have a maximum height of 20 feet, while the reference chart at the end of this section indicates that the lowest edge of temporary building sign shall be at least 8 feet above the finished grade and shall not extend beyond the height of the building. The reference chart at the end of the section provides a summary for freestanding and building signs. Therefore, to avoid confusion, we recommend this chart be revised to include the 20-foot maximum height for temporary building signs.

   b. **Permanent sign**—Proposed Section 175-112.C(1), related to building signs, contains no height requirement for permanent signs, while the reference chart at the end of this section
indicates that the lowest edge of permanent building sign shall be at least 8 feet above the finished grade and shall not extend beyond the height of the building. This inconsistency should be addressed.

We also note that proposed Section 175-110.A(5)(d)(i) states that no portion of a marquee sign (a type of building sign) shall extend vertically above the eave line. This would not be consistent with reference chart at the end of this Section 175-112 which indicates the sign shall not extend beyond the height of the building.

3. Differentiation between permanent and temporary sign requirements—Proposed Section 175-111.C contains number, area and height requirements for signs related to residential developments containing more than ten units, but unlike the sign requirements for other uses in the residential districts, these requirements are not specified between permanent and temporary signs. While the number, area and height requirements are the same for temporary and permanent signs, it may be worthwhile having separate requirements to reflect how the two are separated in the reference chart at the end of the section. This may eliminate the potential for misinterpretation of these requirements.

4. Signs for multi-tenant shopping centers
   a. Reference to use—Proposed Section 175-113.F uses the term multi-tenant shopping center. To avoid misinterpretation, we recommend that the term be changed to just shopping center and the use identifier “E-14” be used to be consistent with the use requirements in Section 175-14.E(14) of the zoning ordinance.
   b. Regional arterial streets—The requirements of proposed Section 175-113.F are limited to multi-tenant shopping centers with frontage on regional arterial streets. Section 175-14.E(14)(c) of the zoning ordinance requires use E-14 shopping center to be located on an arterial or higher order road, with no specification of what type of arterial. Section 153-24.B(2)(c) of the subdivision and land development ordinance includes regional arterial streets and community arterial streets in the street hierarchy listing. If the proposed sign regulations of Section 175-113.F are only intended for shopping centers along regional arterials, we recommend that an additional requirement be included in this section to specifically indicate that signs for shopping centers along community arterials and higher order streets other than regional arterials shall meet the requirements of all other sign requirements in Section 175-113. This may eliminate the potential for misinterpretation of these requirements.
   c. Differentiation between freestanding and building sign requirements—Proposed Section 175-113.F contains number, height, area and illumination requirements for signs related to signs for multi-tenant shopping centers, but these requirements are not specified between freestanding (except for number) and building signs. Sections 175-113.B and 175-113.C provide these requirements generically for the commercial and industrial zoning districts. It may be worthwhile to have separate requirements to mirror how permanent and temporary, freestanding and building signs are separated in the reference chart at the end of the section. This may eliminate the potential for misinterpretation of these requirements.

In addition, since proposed Section 175-113.F provides specific signs requirements for the multi-tenant shopping center use in the commercial and industrial districts, it’s unclear whether other signs such as exempt signs, electronic message center signs, steel pole banner signs, and temporary construction signs addressed in section 175-113.A, 175-113.D, 175-113.E, and 175-113.G are permitted as part of a multi-tenant shopping center use.
5. **Residential signs in the commercial and industrial districts**—The reference table at the end of proposed Section 175-113.F contains a footnote requiring “Any residential use(s) within the above mentioned zoning districts (commercial and industrial districts) shall be permitted to have sign(s) in accordance with the requirements of sign(s) permitted in residential districts for such use (refer to §175-111). Since this is an important requirement, we recommend that it be incorporated as a specific requirement in Section 175-113.F rather than just a footnote to a reference table.

6. **Approval Procedure for time extension**—The proposed language for extending a temporary use permit beyond a two-year period (Section 175-16.H(5)), gives authority to the “Zoning Officer or Board of Supervisors”. These entities have different roles and rights, so it may be clearer to select one or the other.

7. **Editorial comments**
   
a. **Incomplete and missing figures**—Figures 1, 2, 4, and 6 in the copy of the proposed amendment that our office received contain images that are cut-off/incomplete. In addition, there is no Figure 3.

   b. **Abbreviations/symbol**—To ensure that there is no misinterpretation, we recommend that the abbreviations and symbols in proposed Sections 175-110.C(6)(a), 175-110.C(6)(d), 175-110.D(4)(a), 175-110.D(4)(b), and 175-111.C(3), be replaced with the words feet, foot-candles, inches, inches, and square feet, respectively.

   c. **Consistent reference**—Since proposed Section 175-112.C(2)[b] indicates that “each” temporary sign shall have a maximum area of 16 square feet, we recommend that the reference table at the end this section indicate that the maximum area is 16 square feet “per each sign.”

   d. **Sign area per dwelling unit**—The reference chart at the end of proposed Section 175-114 indicates that the sign are for temporary signs for “all other residential” uses is 4 square feet “per dwelling unit.” Proposed Section 175-114.B(2)[b] states that maximum area for temporary for residential uses is just 4 square feet. To avoid misinterpretation, we recommend that proposed Section 175-114.B(2)[b] be revised to specify the maximum square footage of temporary signs for “all other residential uses” is 4 square feet per dwelling unit.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisor’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

**TAK:de**

**cc:** Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering Corts, & Summerson, Township Engineer  
Jeffrey P. Garton, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, LLP, Township Solicitor  
Stephanie J. Mason, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hulmeville Borough Council
    Hulmeville Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
Applicant: Borough Council
Received: December 7, 2016
Hearing Date: February 2017

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 5, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Revise the floodplain requirements in the zoning ordinance in order to comply with the federal and state floodplain regulations and the new flood insurance maps by amending the following sections:

Section 27-703.2.B(2) by deleting this subsection that states a permit shall not be required for minor repairs to existing buildings or structures.

Section 27-703.3.A replacing the first sentence with the following: “The Zoning Officer is hereby appointed to administer and enforce this ordinance and is referred to herein as the Floodplain Administrator.”

Section 27-703.3.C(3) to replace the words “repetitive loss concerns” with the words “cumulative substantial damage.”

Section 27-703.4.A(1) to change the date of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps from March 16, 2015 to March 21, 2017 (which are the maps recently adopted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)).

Section 27-703.7.B(5) to replace the words “repetitive loss” with the words “cumulative substantial damage.”
Sections 27-703.9.B(21) and 27-703.9.B(29) to delete the terms and associated definitions for minor repairs and repetitive loss.

Section 27-703.9.B(22) to change the start date of new construction from March 16, 2015 to March 21, 2017.

Section 27-703.9.B(35) to revise the definition of substantial improvement to replace the words “repetitive loss concerns” with the words “cumulative substantial damage.”

Section 27-703.9 to add the term and definition for cumulative substantial damage.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the borough adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:dc

cc: Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Cortes, & Summerson, Borough Engineer
    Robert M. DeBias, Esq., Wood & Floge, Borough Solicitor
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 4, 2017
BCPC #20-16-CR1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors
Lower Makefield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Land Development – Snipes Tract Athletic Fields
TMP #20-16-1-1; 20-16-2
Applicant: Lower Makefield Township
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: November 14, 2016
Date Received: December 5, 2016

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 4, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Develop a municipal athletic field complex on a 36.2-acre site. The planned facilities will include one small and three large athletic fields, a pavilion, a concession stand, restrooms, a future skate park, and a walking trail system. Two roadway accesses are proposed: one from Dolington Road and one from Quarry Hill Court. A total of 156 parking spaces is provided. Public water and sewerage are intended to serve the complex.

Location: At the northwestern corner of Dolington and Quarry roads. Interstate 95 adjoins the site to the north.

Zoning: The R-1 Residential Low-Density District permits a public recreational facility on a minimum site area of 1 acre with a minimum lot width of 160 feet at the front building setback line. Correspondence submitted with the plan indicates that, on November 15, 2016, the Lower Makefield Township Zoning Hearing Board granted variances for the following sections of the ordinance:

Section 200-18 to not be required to provide a 100-foot setback from an arterial road; to allow the proposed equipment sheds within 26 feet and the salt storage shed within 49 feet of the I-95 right-of-way.
Section 200-63 to not be required to provide an 80-foot setback from a collector road; to allow the proposed future skate park within 44 feet of the Dolington Road right-of-way.

Existing Land Use: Public works yard.

**COMMENTS**

1. **Requested waivers**—According to correspondence submitted with the plan and notations on Sheet 2 of 14, waivers are requested from the following sections of the Lower Makefield Township subdivision and land development ordinance:

   178-20.C(9) show significant manmade features within 200 feet of the site
   178-20.C(10) provide a tree inventory of existing mature trees on site, eight inches in caliper or greater, measured four feet above grade level
   178-20.E(29) provide core samples of adjacent roads
   178-20.G provide an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the site
   178-53.A lighting shall be provided by fixtures with a mounting height not more than 20 feet
   178-56.A provide a 30-foot wide easement for the storm and sanitary sewer
   178-56.C nothing other than grass shall be permitted to be placed, planted, set or put within the area of an easement
   178-93.B(3)(a) perform groundwater mounding analysis for the proposed infiltration areas
   178-93.F(3)(c) minimum diameter of all storm drainage pipe shall be 18 inches or an equivalent thereto
   178-93.F(3)(d) increment size changes to storm drainage pipes shall be six inches in diameter
   178-93.F(3)(h) outside of cartways, all pipes shall have a minimum cover of two feet
   178-95.C(7) & (8) lot slope shall not be flatter than 2 percent and swales for surface runoff shall have a minimum slope of 2 percent
   178-95.C(10) provide a 6-inch drop within 15 feet of the proposed concession stand.

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for each waiver is based, and the minimum modification necessary. Per Section 512.1(a) of the MPC, a determination as to whether the requested waivers shall be granted will be necessary.

2. **Requested stormwater management waivers**—Notations on Sheet 2 of 14 and correspondence submitted with the plan indicate that waivers are requested from the following sections of the Stormwater Management – Delaware River South Watershed Ordinance (Chapter 173):

   173-12.K to not require that the stormwater runoff detention facilities completely drain both the volume control and rate control capacities over a period not less than 24 hours from the end of the design storm
   173-14.C(6)(g) to not require a groundwater mounding analysis (due to the favorable on-site infiltration test results)
These requests should be discussed and resolved prior to approval of the plan.

3. Parking

   a. **Location of parking spaces**—Parking for the recreational facility is provided through perpendicular parking spaces directly abutting the access drive through the site. While we acknowledge that for most of the spaces, individuals that are parked in those spaces will not have to cross the access drive to reach the fields, the layout does pose concerns over potential conflicts between vehicles traveling along the main drive and vehicles attempting to maneuver into and out of the parking spaces. It is suggested that the parking layout be redesigned to eliminate these potential conflicts. For instance, parking courts located separate from the access drive would eliminate perpendicular parking along the access drive.

   b. **Handicapped parking spaces**—Section 200-78.E.(4) of the zoning ordinance requires one handicapped-accessible parking space for every 25 spaces in a parking area. The plan delineates 4 handicapped-accessible spaces. However, based on the total number of 156 parking spaces shown on the plan, a minimum of 7 handicapped-accessible spaces should be provided. The plan should be revised to comply with this ordinance requirement.

4. **Crosswalk**—It is recommended that a pedestrian crosswalk be considered across Quarry Road from the bike path on the site to the existing sidewalk and bike path on the other side of the roadway (at Creamery Road.)

5. **Impervious surface**—The plan should be revised to indicate if the proposed impervious surface coverage includes the future skate park.

6. **Lights**—Sheet 10 of 14 indicates that the minimum height of lighting standards proposed for the site is 50 feet, with some of the lighting standards proposed to have a height of 80 feet. Since bright lighting is needed to adequately illuminate outdoor recreation facilities for use during night time hours, ways to minimize impacts to surrounding neighborhoods should be considered.

7. **Tree protection fencing**—Information on Sheet 6 of 14 indicates that along some areas of trees that are to remain, a combination of super filter fence and tree protection are proposed. While the detail for tree protection fencing on Sheet 7 of 14 shows a 48-inch high snow fence which is in compliance with Section 178-85.D.(3) of the subdivision and land development ordinance, a detail for the super filter fabric fence indicates a height of 33 inches. The required tree protection fencing and the super filter fabric fence are generally intended to serve different purposes. For compliance with Section 178-85.D.(3) of the subdivision and land development ordinance, protection fencing along the areas of the proposed tree line should have a minimum height of 48 inches.

8. **Protection for vehicles**—If the proposed parking layout is retained, it is recommended that consideration be given to utilizing some type of netting or barrier at each end of the playing fields to protect vehicles from balls that are kicked or thrown past the end zones.
9. **Sewage facilities**—The township should submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 planning module for land development must be submitted for this proposal.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision on this proposal.

LMW: jmk

cc: Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager (via email)
Mark W. Eisold, P.E., Boucher & James, Inc.
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
   New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Various

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: December 13, 2016
Hearing Date: January 23, 2017

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at its meeting on January 4, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Actions: Amend various sections of the zoning ordinance, as follows:

- General References – All references to “lot size” will be amended to “lot area.”
- Section 27-201 – Rename various figures within various definitions; amend definition of “Lot Area;” adding various references to certain figures at the end of the definitions section; and replacing Figure 5 concerning building height with a new diagram.
- Section 27-305.G.G1.b.1 – Amend G1, Utilities use.
- Section 27-305.H.H14.b.1 – Amend H14, Accessory Dwelling use.
- Section 27-305.J.J24.b – Adding new dimensional requirements to the shopping center use.
- Section 27-305.J.J31.c.6 – Amend performance and design regulations for J31, Planned Community Center Mixed Use.
- Section 27-305.J.J32.c.4 – Amend performance and design regulations for J32, Neighborhood Commercial Center.
- Section 27-305.K.K5.b.2 – Amend regulations for K5, Contracting use.
- Section 27-305.K.K15.b.5 – Amend regulations for K15, Industrial Park use.
- Section 27-305.K.K19 – Amend regulations for Small Lot Industrial use.
- Section 27-502 – Amend area and dimensional requirements for the Watershed District.
• Section 27-503 – Rename and amend the base site calculations for a B1 subdivision within the Watershed District.
• Section 27-504.a – Amend the site capacity calculations within the Watershed District.
• Section 27-505 – Amend the environmentally sensitive land standards within the Watershed District.
• Section 27-702.c – Amend the accessory uses/structures section within the SR-1, Suburban Residential District.
• Section 27-804 – Amend the accessory uses/structures section within the SR-2, Suburban Residential District.
• Section 27-902.c – Amend the accessory uses/structures section within the RR, Residential District.
• Section 27-1002.c – Amend the accessory uses/structures section within the VR, Village Residential District.
• Section 27-1301.c – Within the C-2, Commercial District, add Use J25, Self-Storage as a permitted Conditional Use and remove Use K20, Low Impact Assembly as a permitted Conditional use.
• Section 27-1701.c – Remove Use K19, Small Lot Industrial as a permitted Conditional Use within the I, Industrial District.
• Section 27-1702 – Amend the area and dimensional requirements within the I, Industrial District.
• Section 27-1801.c – Remove Use K19, Small Lot Industrial as a permitted Conditional Use within the IO, Industrial/Office District.
• Section 27-1802 – Amend the area and dimensional requirements within the IO, Industrial/Office District.
• Section 27-2108 – Remove text pertaining to 27-2108, Accessory Buildings in Yards and replace with “Reserved.”
• Section 27-2402.b – Amend base site area section.
• Section 27-2904.c.3 – Amend off street parking requirement.
• Section 27-2904.j.2(d) – Amend off street parking requirement.
• Attachment 2, Zoning Districts – Rename Use J25, Mini-Warehouse to Use J25, Self-Storage and to allow the use as a permitted Conditional Use in the C-2 District; add “Reserved” to the K19 Use; and prohibit Use K20, Low Impact Assembly in the C-2 District.

COMMENTS

Many of the text amendments are consistent with the recently adopted comprehensive plan especially with regards to the goals and objectives to protect the existing low-density character and environmentally sensitive areas of Planning Area 3, which encompass the CR and WS districts. We recommend that township officials consider the following comments prior to the adoption of the proposed amendment.

1. Article IV—There are several references to figures that will need to be changed prior to adoption and the figures on pages 27-32 and 27-33 that illustrate different scenarios of lot area, buildable area, and building envelope are labeled as Figures 1 and 2. There may some misinterpretation since
Figures 1 and 2 are located on pages prior and we suggest that these illustrations be renamed and keyed to the proper definition.

2. **Article VII**—The dimensional requirements within the CR and WS districts notate maximum building coverage as opposed to maximum building area as proposed in the text amendments. For consistency, we recommend changing the proposed ordinance language from “maximum building area” to “maximum building coverage.”

3. **Article VIII**—There appears to be two existing shopping center areas along Butler Avenue located in the C-2 District. The township should ensure that no nonconforming issues are created by adding the new dimensional requirements for Use J24, Shopping Center, which is only permitted in the C-2 Commercial District.

4. **Article IX**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-1201.c permits Use L2, Outside Storage as a Conditional Use within the C-1 District. The township should consider adding Use L2, Outdoor Storage to the permitted uses allowed in Use J31, Planned Community Center Mixed Use in zoning ordinance Section 27-305.JJ31.b.1.

5. **Article X**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-1201.c permits Use L2, Outside Storage as a Conditional Use within the C-1 District. The township should consider adding Use L2, Outdoor Storage to the permitted uses allowed in Use J32, Neighborhood Commercial Center in zoning ordinance Section 27-305.JJ32.b.

6. **Article XII**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-1201.c permits Use L2, Outside Storage as a Conditional Use within the I District. The township should consider adding Use L2, Outdoor Storage to the permitted uses allowed in Use K15, Industrial Park in zoning ordinance Section 27-305.KK15.b.3.

7. **Article XIII**—Since Use K19, Small Lot Industrial is being eliminating as a use within the township, the references to Use K19 dimensional requirements within the I District (zoning ordinance Section 27-1702.b. and c.2) and within the IO District (zoning ordinance Section 27-1802.b. and c.2) should be removed from the ordinance.

8. **Article XV**—For clarity, we recommend Section 27-503.a.2 be revised to replace the semicolon with a comma after the word ‘roads,’ since a comma is used after the word ‘easements,’ which is the second item in this listing, and add “land which” following the “and/or.” Throughout the calculations for Base Site Area, “and/or” is used. Township officials should ensure that this is the proper intent or if “and” is more appropriate, given its context within the sentence.

In addition, land subtracted from the gross site area should be clarified in Section 27-503.a.4. If the intent of the township is to subtract the area of environmentally sensitive land that is considered protected with a protection ratio (such as woodlands, steep slopes, agricultural soils, floodplains, wetlands lakes and ponds), the wording should be more concise. Instead of “natural resource protection,” the township should consider wording such as “natural resource protected land” as noted in Section 27-504.a.1.d and Section 27-505.

9. **Article XVI**—For clarity, we recommend Section 27-504.a.2 be revised to replace the semicolon with a comma after the word ‘roads,’ since a comma is used after the word ‘easements,’ which is the second item in this listing, and add “land which” following the “and/or.” Throughout the
calculations for Base Site Area, “and/or” is used. Township officials should ensure that this is the proper intent or if “and” is more appropriate, given its context within the sentence.

In addition, land subtracted from the gross site area should be clarified in Section 27-504.a.4. If the intent of the township is to subtract the area of environmentally sensitive land that is considered protected with a protection ratio (such as woodlands, steep slopes, agricultural soils, floodplains, wetlands lakes and ponds), the wording should be more concise. Instead of “natural resource protection,” the township should consider wording such as “natural resource protected land” as noted in Section 27-504.a.1.d and Section 27-505.

10. **Article XVII**—It appears that the only change is that “prime” was removed before agricultural soils under the natural resources heading. The township should verify that all other references that note “prime agricultural soils” in the ordinance have removed “prime” in order to be consistent throughout, such as in Attachment 1, Appendix A, Environmental Impact Statement Report that references prime agricultural soils.

11. **Article XXVII**—The footnote (1) for uses permitted by right in the table of area and dimensional requirements does not have a reference note.

12. **Article XVIII**—Section 27-2108 does provide additional requirements for some accessory buildings, such as the size and height of a storage shed that would be removed if this section is changed to “Reserved.” The township should ensure that all requirements and standards regarding accessory structures are covered within the districts that permit accessory buildings and structures.

13. **Article XXIX**—For clarity, we recommend Section 27-2402.b be revised to add “land which” following the “and/or.”

    In addition, land subtracted from the gross site area should be clarified in Section 27-2402.b If the intent of the township is to subtract the area of environmentally sensitive land that is protected with a protection ratio (such as woodlands, steep slopes, agricultural soils, floodplains, wetlands lakes and ponds), the wording should be more concise. Instead of “natural resource protection,” the township should consider wording such as “natural resource protected land” and be consistent with the base site area tables associated with the WS District.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

JSI:dc

cc: Peter Nelson, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Township Solicitor
    Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Newtown Borough Council
    Newtown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations

Applicant: Borough Council
Received: December 9, 2016
Hearing Date: January 10, 2017

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 5, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Revise the floodplain requirements in the zoning ordinance in order to comply with the federal and state floodplain regulations and the new flood insurance maps by amending the following sections:

Section 508.B.2.b by deleting subsection (b) that states a permit shall not be required for minor repairs to existing buildings or structures.

Section 508.C.1 replacing the first sentence with the following: “The Zoning Officer is hereby appointed to administer and enforce this ordinance and is referred to herein as the Floodplain Administrator.”

Section 508.C.3 to replace the words “repetitive loss” with the words “cumulative substantial damage.”

Section 508.D.1.a to change the date of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps from March 16, 2015 to March 21, 2017 (which are the maps recently adopted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)).

Section 508.G.2.f to replace the words “repetitive loss” with the words “cumulative substantial damage.”

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
Sections 508.1.2 to:

- add the term and definition for cumulative substantial damage
- delete the terms and associated definitions for minor repairs and repetitive loss
- change the start date of new construction from March 16, 2015 to March 21, 2017
- revise the definition of substantial improvement to replace the words “repetitive loss” with the words “cumulative substantial damage”
- reletter definitions to account for deletion and addition of terms

COMMENTS

We recommend that the borough adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:dc

cc: Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts, & Summerson, Borough Engineer
    William J. Bolla, Esq., McNamara, Bolla & Panzer, Borough Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO: Solebury Township Board of Supervisors
   Solebury Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Request for an Addition to Agricultural Security Area
         TMPs #41-1-29; 41-1-29-1, -2; 41-13-25-3; 41-2-76-3
         Applicant: Temple Partners II, LP
         Received: December 5, 2016
         Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Act 43 of 1981, the Agricultural Area Security Law as amended, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The review that follows was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held January 4, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: Add five parcels totaling 159.165 acres to Solebury Township’s Agricultural Security Area (ASA).

Landowner: Temple Partners II, LP
Tax Map Parcels: 41-1-29; 41-1-29-1, -2
Location: Northwestern side of Mechanicsville Road, across from Sheffield Dr.
Size of tract: 116.481 acres
Zoning: RB Residential/Agriculture District
Comprehensive Plan: Rural Conservation
Soil Classes: 2e, 2w, 3e, 3w, 4w

Landowner: Temple Partners II, LP
Tax Map Parcel: 41-13-25-3
Location: Northwestern side of Upper York Road, north of Red Fox Drive
Size of tract: 24.09 acres
Zoning: RB Residential/Agriculture District
Comprehensive Plan: Rural Conservation
Soil Classes: 1, 2e, 2w, 3e, 3w
Landowner: Temple Partners II, LP
Tax Map Parcel: 41-2-76-3
Location: Southeastern side of Saw Mill Road, south of Aquetong Road
Size of tract: 18.594 acres
Zoning: RB Residential/Agriculture District
Comprehensive Plan: Rural Conservation and Historic Village
Soil Classes: 2e, 3e, 3w, 4w

COMMENTS

The Bucks County Planning Commission recommends that the five parcels in Solebury Township be added to the ASA since they comply with the requirements of Act 43, and are consistent with applicable comprehensive plans and land use ordinances.

The parcels are actively farmed and 100 percent of its soils are designated by the Natural Resources Conservation Service’s land capability classification as Class I through IV. According to the Plan for Land Use (Map 14) in the Solebury Township Comprehensive Plan (2014), the parcels are classified as Rural Conservation. The broad Rural Conservation land use designation is the logical focus for continued township attention by the Land Preservation Committee to promote public and private conservation efforts. This involves formal and informal liaisons among the township and individual landowners, local conservation organizations, and county and state programs for open space and farmland conservation.

In addition, the inclusion of the parcels within the ASA is consistent with the provisions of the RB Residential/Agriculture District, which is designed to preserve the character of existing residential and agricultural areas of the Township.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decisions regarding this matter.

CIG:dc

cc: Temple Partners II, LP
    Jordan Yeager, Esq., Curtin & Heefner, Township Solicitor
    Dennis H. Carney, Township Manager (via email)
    Richard B. Harvey, Bucks County Agricultural Preservation Program
MEMORANDUM

TO: Upper Makefield Township Board of Supervisors
   Upper Makefield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Topsoil Requirements

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 4, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Chapter 22, Section 316 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) to require that no topsoil shall be removed from development sites and to require that topsoil disturbed during grading be returned to the site and spread at a minimum depth of ten inches after settlement and compaction.

Amend Chapter 22, Section 325.1.A of the SALDO to specify that in no event shall topsoil be removed from the parcel of land which is the subject of the subdivision or land development without the approval of the Board of Supervisors.

COMMENTS

We offer the following editorial comment.

1. Editorial Comments—The proposed amendment indicates that the subsections C & D will be added to Chapter 22, Section 316. Currently only Chapter 22, Section 316.6 contains A & B subsections. The amendment should be revised to reflect its appropriate placement in Section 316.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

PWG:dc

cc: Mary Eberle, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher
Larry Young, P.E., Tri-State Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc.
David R. Nyman, Interim Township Manager (via email)
Dave Kuhns, Upper Makefield Township, Director of Planning and Zoning
CONFIDENTIAL—NOT FOR RELEASE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Upper Southampton Township Board of Supervisors
   Upper Southampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Medical Marijuana

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: December 5, 2016
Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 4, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to establish new use classifications relating to medical marijuana dispensary use and medical marijuana grower/processor uses. The ordinance will provide new definitions and standards for the new uses.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Proposed Use 30.D., Medical Marijuana Dispensary would be permitted as a special exception in the RS Retail Services District. The special exception conditions and criteria include:

- Operate with hours from 9 am to 9 pm daily.
- May only be located in Shopping Centers (Use 41).
- The dispensary and operation shall be in full compliance with federal, state, and local laws including but not limited to the Medical Marijuana Act.

Proposed Use 53.A. Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor would be permitted as a special exception in the LI Light Industrial District. The special exception conditions and criteria include, and are not limited to:

- The growing and processing operation shall be in full compliance with federal, state, and local laws including but not limited to the Medical Marijuana Act.
- Must operate entirely within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility.
- 2 acre minimum lot size.
• Setback 1,000 feet from parcels containing a public, private, or parochial school, or day-care center.
• Shall submit a disposal plan to, and obtain approval from, the Chief of Police. All medical marijuana remnants and by-products shall be disposed of according to an approved plan, and shall not be placed within an exterior refuse container.
• No emission of dust, odors, vapors, or fumes.
• No retail sales or use of medical marijuana permitted on the premises.
• Maintain monitored security staff 24 hours a day and 7 days a week.
• Submit a site plan and floor plan for approval by the Township engineer and by the Township Building Code Official.

Section 185-147, Required Off-street parking space requirements is proposed to be amended as follows:
• Use 30.D.: Medical Marijuana Dispensary—1 parking space per 200 square feet of gross floor area.
• Use 53.A.: Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor—1 parking space per 3000 square feet of gross floor area.

Existing Zoning Provisions: Use 41 Shopping Center are a cluster of commercial establishments, planned, developed, owned, and managed as a unit and related in location, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, size and type of shops to the trade area that the unit serves, provided that a minimum lot area of 5 acres is required, except that 3-acre tracts may be developed as shopping centers if they access points with existing contiguous shopping centers.

COMMENTS

The zoning provisions proposed should comply with the State’s Medical Marijuana Act as well as with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we are relying on the township to ensure that the proposed regulations are consistent with these laws and any other applicable laws prior to enactment. Prior to adoption, we offer the following comments for consideration:

1. **Medical marijuana uses**—Chapter 8 Dispensaries, Section 802(a)(3) of the Medical Marijuana Act requires that a dispensary not be located within 1,000 feet of a property line of a public, private or parochial school or day-care center. The township has proposed the same 1,000-foot setback requirement for the grower/processor use. The township should verify the locations of all public, private or parochial schools or day-care centers relative to the 1,000-foot setback in order to determine if there is adequate area zoned for both uses.

2. **Disposal plan**—The proposed ordinance includes a provision that requires a grower/processor to provide a disposal plan to the Chief of Police for approval for any medical marijuana remnants and byproducts. While the Medical Marijuana Act does require that a grower/processor or a dispensary have a system to track waste as a part of the required electronic tracking system, the Act does not require that disposal plans be submitted to each municipality. Any medical marijuana waste will be regulated by the Department of Health according to their standards, as a part of the permitting and licensing requirements to operate a medical marijuana facility.
The township staff reviewing the plan may not have expertise in medical waste or medical marijuana. The proposed ordinance does not provide any standards or guidance as to what an acceptable disposal plan might be, which could create uncertainty and confusion for both the applicant and reviewer.

We suggest this be treated similarly to other medical waste, such as that from a pharmacy. Pharmacies are not required to provide any sort of waste disposal plan, at least not under the provisions of the zoning ordinance, but are subject to other health, safety, and security regulations not covered within the zoning ordinance.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

JSI:dc

cc: Donald E. Williams, Esq., Township Solicitor
    Joe Golden, Township Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>12206</td>
<td>(5-24-113-1; 5-24-114)</td>
<td>Plunto</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Township</td>
<td>10582-B</td>
<td>(9-4-2 &amp; -2-2)</td>
<td>Pine Run Community-New Community Hub</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 35,716 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rockhill Township</td>
<td>10996-A</td>
<td>(12-8-115-2, -8-127 &amp; -9-149)</td>
<td>Pennguide Airport Business Park</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Commercial Land Development: 627,100 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rockhill Township</td>
<td>10996-B</td>
<td>(12-9-132-1 &amp; -149)</td>
<td>Pennguide Airport Corporate Jet Hangar</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development 64,800 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>4465-F</td>
<td>(13-47-83-1, -81-1)</td>
<td>Cam Real Estate Partnership, LP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>17 Industrial Lease Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>12208</td>
<td>(15-8-1)</td>
<td>701 Route 113</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development 4,714 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>5303-E</td>
<td>(22-40-26-10)</td>
<td>The Marketplace at Oxford Valley, LP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development 4,500 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>12204</td>
<td>(22-45-322, -323, -324)</td>
<td>324 &amp; 346 Wyoming Avenue</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Township</td>
<td>8008-C</td>
<td>(23-15-118, &amp; -118-1)</td>
<td>Barin Tract</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development 125,000 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>12154</td>
<td>(26-3-114)</td>
<td>Maxine M. Eagond</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>5 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Borough</td>
<td>12202</td>
<td>(28-2-193-1)</td>
<td>223 N. State Street</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 1,773 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>12205</td>
<td>(31-1-8-15)</td>
<td>Giuliani Family LTD Partnership</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 5,280 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>BCPC Number</td>
<td>Tax Parcel Numbers</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Submission Level</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>12203</td>
<td>(33-7-4, -4-1, -5, 33-3-20, -21, 12-9-149)</td>
<td>Pennridge Airport Business Park</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Commercial Land Development: 245,700 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>10392-C</td>
<td>(50-32-51)</td>
<td>Valley Square Phase 1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 38,300 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightstown Township</td>
<td>5076-G</td>
<td>(53-2-103-2)</td>
<td>2629 Windy Bush Road</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bensalem Township Mayor
    Bensalem Township Council
    Bensalem Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Holy Ghost Preparatory School

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Renovate an existing warehouse building and parking lot for use as a 26,043-square-foot school gymnasium and auditorium. A 2-story residence and storage buildings are proposed to be removed. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: At the northeast corner of Bristol Pike (U.S. Route 13) and Bensalem Avenue.

Zoning: The G-C General Commercial District does not permit educational uses. Permitted uses requires on a minimum lot area of 7,200 square feet with a minimum lot width of 60 feet. The Bensalem Township Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances from the township zoning ordinance at a hearing held on October 4, 2012:

232-380 To allow a gymnasium and auditorium use.
232-381(2) To exceed the maximum required building coverage.
232-381(2); 167(d)1 To exceed the maximum required impervious coverage in the G-C Commercial and R-2 Residential Districts. The site is located entirely in the G-C General Commercial District.
232-581(b) To allow the expansion of nonconforming use within the required G-C General Commercial District building setbacks.
232-581(b) To allow expansion of a nonconforming use within the required 75-foot front yard setback. This variance is listed on Sheet C2.1 as Section 232-281(3a).
232-581(b)  To allow expansion of a nonconforming use within the required 35-foot rear yard setback. This variance is listed on Sheet C2.1 as Section 232-281(3)a.

232-586(a)(2)  To allow parking within the required buffer area.

232-586(c)(3); (d)(3)  To allow a reduction in the required number of parking spaces.

232-586(d)(3)b  To permit parking within 25 feet of adjacent streets and property lines. This variance is listed on Sheet C2.1 as Section 286(d)(3)b.

232-587  To provide no off-street loading space.

232-592(1)  To allow a width reduction for the required 20-foot residential buffer.

232-593  To allow a width reduction for the required 75-foot residential district boundary setback.

Present Use: Warehouse.

**COMMENTS**

1. **Waivers**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   196-61(b)(1)  Requires storm sewers with a minimum 18-inch diameter reinforced concrete pipe. Plan proposes a 12-inch diameter ductile iron pipe under traffic conditions and 12-inch HDPE pipe under landscaped conditions. The shallow depth of the existing infrastructure, the size of the existing pipes, and cover conditions do not allow for pipes greater than 18 inches in diameter in the locations where 12-inch diameter pipes are proposed.

   196-62(b)(12)  Requires a minimum 2 feet of cover to be maintained over all storm drains and the top of all storm drain pipes to be at least ½-foot below subgrade elevation. Due to the shallow depth of the existing infrastructure and the size of the existing pipes, cover conditions do not allow a minimum of 24 inches of cover. Pipes will be provided with minimal cover conditions between 12 and 24 inches.

   201-41(d)(9)  Requires plans to show utilities, culverts, bridges, railroads, or other manmade features within 400 feet of the boundaries of the development. Applicant is proposing a reuse of the existing structure.

   201-41(d)(10)  Requires plan to show contour lines at vertical intervals of not more than one foot for land with a slope of three percent or less, two feet for land with a slope up to and including 15 percent, and at intervals of not more than five feet for land with a slope exceeding 15 percent. Location and level data to which contour elevations refer shall be based on the Bensalem Township Municipal Authority sanitary sewer system. Applicant requests use of NAVD 1988 survey data instead of the Bensalem Township Municipal Authority’s sanitary sewer data.

   201-41(d)(15)  Requires a wetland certification to be placed on the plan. Applicant is proposing reuse of existing structure.

   201-103  Requirements for open space, recreation areas, and community facilities. Applicant is proposing reuse of an existing structure for educational/recreational purposes for the school.
201-106(a)(1)a. Requires no changes to be made in the contour of the land: no grading, excavating, removal or destruction of the topsoil, trees or other vegetative cover of the land shall be commenced within a proposed subdivision and land development until such time as a plan for minimizing erosion and sedimentation has been received by the county conservation district. The amount of disturbance will be limited on the highly-developed property.

201-106(a)(2)a.14 Requires no grassed area to have a slope of less than two percent. Some of the existing conditions do not meet this requirement.

201-106(c)(2) Requires street trees to be planted at intervals of no more than 20 feet or at a greater interval as determined by the Shade Tree Commission dependent upon species selected or an equivalent number to be planted in an informal arrangement, but in no case will any trees be planted in existing or proposed street rights-of-way. Trees are not permitted to be planted within right-of-way or within 10 feet of all underground utilities.

201-108(c)(3) Requires driveway access to a lot to be no less than 24 feet in width and not exceed 30 feet in width at the street line. The proposed relocation of the driveway exceeds 30 feet at the street line to provide a safe configuration for access to and from Route 13.

201-114(p) Requires all off-street commercial parking which parallel any public right-of-way to be screened from view by means of earthen berms, masonry or brick walls, or a combination of both, and landscaping. Existing building separation to the property line does not prove sufficient space.

201-114(g) Requires parking areas to be located or designed in such a manner that they are visible secluded at eye level from the adjacent residential district. Existing building separation to the property line does not prove sufficient space.

The final plan should note all granted waivers.

2. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MAR:dc

cc: Timothy Woods, Holy Ghost Preparatory School
Keith J. Marshall, P.E., Nave Newell, Inc.
Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning
Ron Gans, P.E., Municipal Engineer, O’Donnell & Naccarato
William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Executive and Council  
Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Lot Line Change for Plunto  
TMP #5-24-113-1; 5-24-114

Applicant: Roberta M. Plunto, Executrix of the Estate of Katherine Rolston
Owner: Katherine S. Rolston
Plan Dated: October 28, 2016
Date Received: November 18, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Relocate an existing lot line between two residential parcels twelve feet east of its present location to convey 1,500 square feet of land from Lot 2 (TMP #5-24-113-1) to Lot 1 (TMP #5-24-114) and form lots of 11,000 square feet and 14,000 square feet, respectively. Lot 1 contains a single-family detached dwelling; Lot 2 contains a shed. Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: At the northeast corner of Green Avenue and Century Avenue. Glenrich Avenue, a paper street, borders the site to the east.

Zoning: R-1 Residence District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots having a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 75 feet. The maximum building area and impervious surface ratios are 20 and 30 percent, respectively.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Sidewalks and curbs**—Section 177-35.A, 177-43.A, and 177-45.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance require sidewalks and curbs along streets unless determined unnecessary by Council. The plan should be revised to comply with these requirements unless it is determined that sidewalks and curbs are unnecessary in this area.
2. **Street trees**—Section 177-51.A.(1)(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that within any subdivision, street trees shall be planted along streets where suitable existing trees or natural wooded areas do not exist. The plan should be revised to indicate street trees, either existing or proposed, in compliance with this requirement.

3. **Zoning requirements**—Zoning information shown in the Zoning Requirements table indicates that the maximum building coverage is 30 percent. The plan should be revised to correctly indicate that the maximum building coverage in the R-1 District is 20 percent (zoning ordinance Section 205-23.C.)

4. **Plan information**—The plan should be revised to provide the following required information in accordance with Section 177 of the subdivision and land development ordinance:

   - 177-93.C.(2) Names of owners, tax parcel numbers, and zoning classification of land immediately adjacent to or across from the tract.
   - 177-93.C.(3) Widths of streets, the location of sanitary sewers, storm drains, water mains, culverts, petroleum or petroleum product lines, gas lines, electric and telephone lines, fire hydrants, and all other utilities or significant man-made features on or within 200 feet of any part of the tract.
   - 177-93.C.(5) Location, size, and ownership of all underground utilities.
   - 177-93.C.(6) Appropriate contours at two- to five-foot intervals.
   - 177-93.C.(9) Location of species and size of large trees standing alone.
   - 177-93.D.(7) Location of required plantings in accordance with Section 177-51 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

5. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2016, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dc

cc: Roberta M. Plunto  
Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor  
William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)  
Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Department of Licenses and Inspections (via email)  
Thomas Scott, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors
    Doylestown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—Pine Run Community-New Community Hub
    TMP #9-4-2 and 9-4-2-2
    Applicant: Pine Run Community
    Owner: Doylestown Hospital
    Plan Dated: September 11, 2015
    Last Revised: November 1, 2016
    Date Received: December 1, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Demolish the existing community hub and replace it with a new 35,716-square-foot structure. Modifications to the existing parking facilities and pedestrian access are also proposed. The retirement community comprises 300 units on 42 acres served by existing public water and sewer facilities.

Location: Southern side of Ferry Road, approximately 1,600 feet west of its intersection with Limekiln Road.

Zoning: CR Commercial Retirement District permits Use B-14 (Senior Citizen Housing) on a minimum tract area of 40 acres. A maximum impervious surface coverage of 40 percent and a maximum building coverage of 15 percent is allowed.

Present Use: Institutional; Adult residential community.

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—Sheet SP-1 of the plan indicates that waivers from subdivision and land development ordinance provisions (traffic study, sidewalks and curbing, and bike/hike path) were previously granted in 2006. Township officials should determine if waivers are needed for the new submission, and the plan should be revised if necessary.
2. Impervious surface ratio and building coverage—The existing retirement community is nonconforming in that it currently exceeds the maximum impervious surface ratio and building coverage permitted in the CR District. The stormwater management report submitted with the proposal indicates that the Pine Run Community has engaged in a program to decrease the overall impervious coverage. The proposed building replacement will result in a small increase in impervious cover (4,307 square feet) but an overall a net decrease of approximately 27,500 square feet will have been achieved according to the stormwater management report. Township officials should determine if the proposal for an increase in the impervious surface is acceptable, and the plan should be revised if necessary.

In addition, Note 16 on Sheet SP-4 indicates a net decrease in impervious surface of 23 square feet will result from the proposed improvements. This note should be corrected or more fully explained since it conflicts with the information provided in the stormwater management report.

3. Invasive plant—The plant schedule on the landscape plan (Sheet L-1) proposes 3 *Pyrus calleryana* ‘Cleveland Select’ (callery pear) trees. This nonnative species has been classified as an invasive plant in Pennsylvania by the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) [www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/plants/invasiveplants/index.htm](http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/plants/invasiveplants/index.htm). Therefore, we recommend that the plan be revised to provide an appropriate substitution and that *Pyrus calleryana* be removed from the list of recommended landscape and buffer plants in Section 153-34.(2)(g) of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

4. Sewage facilities—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CIG:de

cc: Pine Run Community  
Scott McMackin, P.E., Cowan Associates, Inc.  
Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Township Engineer  
Stephanie J. Mason, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: East Rockhill Township Board of Supervisors
   East Rockhill Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development—Pennridge Airport Business Park
         TMPs #12-8-115-2, -8-127, and -9-149
         Applicant: Pennridge Development Enterprises, Inc. (c/o Robert D. Brink)
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: November 15, 2016
         Date Received: November 21, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which
has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning
Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a business park on three proposed lots that are located within East Rockhill
Township and Perkasie Borough. Within East Rockhill Township, the eastern portion of the
business park is proposed for office and commercial uses and the western portion is proposed for
manufacturing use only. The sketch plans consist of the following:

Sketch Plan (East)—Create two future development areas (office/commercial) on a portion of
Proposed Lot 1 (TMP #12-9-149) within East Rockhill Township containing 55,201 acres. Future
Development Area A will be approximately 77,700 square feet with a building envelope of
approximately 51,500 square feet. Future Development Area B will be approximately 36,400
square feet with a building envelope of approximately 36,400 square feet. Access to the future
development areas is to be provided by a proposed driveway that connects North Ridge Road to
the existing Pennridge Airport facilities, traversing a portion of the proposed business park located
in Perkasie Borough. No buildings are shown, but the site is intended to be served by public water
and sewer service.

Sketch Plan (West)—Consolidate TMPs #33-2-21, 33-3-20, and 12-8-127 (Proposed Lot 2) totaling
89.216 acres within East Rockhill Township and Perkasie Borough. On the portion of Proposed
Lot 2 within East Rockhill Township (68.132 acres), construct a 150,000-square-foot (1-story)
manufacturing building and associated parking and loading areas. On the portion of Proposed Lot
3 with East Rockhill Township, construct 3 (1-story) manufacturing buildings totaling 340,000
square feet (one building will consist of 100,000 square feet and the other two buildings will comprise 120,000 square feet). A portion of Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) right-of-way for the East Penn railroad line traverses the site. Both lots are intended to be served by public water and sewer service.

A preliminary plan was submitted for a portion of the proposed business park in Perkasie Borough (see BCPC #12202).

Location: The eastern portion of the site is located northwest of North Ridge Road (Route 563), with access from a private driveway that connects the site to Ridge Road in Perkasie Borough. The proposed driveway is opposite West Blooming Glen Drive along North Ridge Road.

The western portion of the site is located northwest of Ridge Road and northeast of Tunnel Road. Access to Ridge Road is proposed along an access drive through the adjacent lot within the Perkasie Borough portion of the proposed business park. There is direct access to Tunnel Road.

Zoning: The I-1 Industrial District permits a variety of uses including industrial, commercial, and office with a minimum lot area and lot width of 5 acres and 300 feet, respectively.

The I-2 Industrial District is similar to the I-1 and permits a variety of uses including industrial, commercial, office, and office and industrial parks, with a minimum lot area and lot width of 5 acres and 300 feet, respectively.

Present Use: Airport and vacant.

COMMENTS

The following comments address Sketch Plan (East) and/or Sketch Plan (West) as indicated:

1. **Lot consolidation**—The plan proposes to consolidate TMPs #33-2-21, 33-3-20, and 12-8-127 located within East Rockhill Township and Perkasie Borough into one lot. According to the Bucks County Board of Assessment (BOA), each tract of land is taxed within its own jurisdiction, so lot consolidation between land within two separate municipalities is not permitted unless one of the taxing authorities or municipalities provides written documentation to the BOA stating that they authorize the subject land(s) within their jurisdiction to be taxed by the adjoining authority/municipality.

2. **Coordination and unification**—East Rockhill Township and Perkasie Borough established a shared vision of creating a high-quality business park within their respective industrial districts adjacent to Pennridge Airport through a cooperative planning effort. This coordinated effort could include an overall master plan establishing a preferred layout, intensity, and location of land uses; a phasing plan; and amendments necessary to enhance the unification and aesthetics of the business park. Currently, the proposed business park contains three separate zoning districts within the two municipalities. In Perkasie, the developer has elected to move forward with rezoning and prepared a land development plan proposal. In

---

1 East Rockhill Township’s vision for properties adjacent to Pennridge Airport is established in their Economic Development Initiative (May 2014) and Perkasie Borough’s vision is established in their 2014 Comprehensive Plan Update.
light of this fact, for both sketch plans, we recommend that a concerted effort be made for the coordination and unification of the design, layout, and aesthetics of the overall business park. Other important cooperative considerations include addressing traffic flow and safety along Ridge Road, Tunnel Road, and nearby intersections, providing onsite amenities for workers and visitors (e.g., ponds/water features, picnic areas, and benches along with trails), and marketing the business park to maximize its economic benefits. We recommend that the township and applicant coordinate with Perkasie Borough in this effort.

3. **Phasing plan and other non-industrial uses**—Sketch Plan (West) proposes 400,000 square feet of manufacturing space. When the Perkasie Borough portion of the business park is included, the total increases to 600,000 square feet. The applicant and municipal officials should discuss the current and future demand for manufacturing use for the proposed business park. We recommend that future plan submissions include a phasing plan to account for the timing of construction.

Recent trends across the County and region have seen higher than normal vacancy rates for large industrial buildings. To fill these vacancies, some municipalities are providing flexibility in order to lease space to non-industrial businesses seeking lower lease rates. These may be opportune locations for certain retail or commercial businesses that do not need the high visibility of being located along arterial or collector roads to be profitable. For instance, businesses that rely on internet access, fitness and gymnasiums, automotive detailing, business or construction offices, and day care facilities may be permitted in industrial parks or industrially-zoned areas through appropriate zoning amendments. Perkasie Borough has amended their industrial-zoned areas adjacent to the airport to accommodate some non-industrial uses and the same could be done within East Rockhill.

4. **Architectural composition**—To promote the high-quality business park ideal, the township and applicant may wish to discuss a preferred architectural appearance with elements and features that will provide visual aesthetics and will assist in unifying the overall appearance of the buildings throughout the site. For instance, to discourage large, rectangular, mass-produced looking buildings, techniques such as modulation and articulation (vertical and horizontal staggering/setback) can be incorporated into the walls and facades to help break up a building’s mass and monotonous appearance. Also, architectural elements such as roof styles and materials may provide visual interest and uniformity.

5. **Airport Area Protection Standards**—In the interest of the health, safety, and welfare of those using the airport, Section 27-1600 Airport Area Protection Standards of the zoning ordinance states that hazards that may cause obstructions that cause hazard to air navigation be prevented. For both sketch plans, the applicant must satisfy the requirements of Sections 27-1602 through 1606, including maximum building height and location adjacent to runway and airport facilities.

6. **SEPTA lands**—Sketch Plan (West) proposes to cross a SEPTA right-of-way (which is leased to the East Penn railroad) with a proposed access road linking lands owned by the applicant on both sides of the tracks. The applicant must contact SEPTA for their approval and to discuss the implications of locating the access road over the rail line segment containing the tunnel. There may be various factors for consideration for this proposal, such as identifying the structural integrity of the tunnel and other legal implications.
7. **Traffic impact study**—Section 22-406.3.A of the zoning ordinance requires that a traffic impact study (TIS) be submitted for all commercial, office, industrial, institutional, and other nonresidential uses requiring subdivision and land development approval. For both sketch plans, future plan submissions should satisfy this requirement if applicable.

8. **Access to Tunnel Road**—Sketch Plan (West) proposes access onto Tunnel Road on the western perimeter of the site. According to the township’s comprehensive plan, Tunnel Road is designated as a ‘Local Access’ road with low traffic volumes and generally short travel distances. Through traffic on local access roads should be discouraged. These roads should be designed for operating speeds of 25 miles per hour or less. The subdivision and land development ordinance requires a minimum right-of-way width of 50 feet and cartway width of 28 feet for these roads. A traffic impact report was submitted along with the proposed land development in the Perkasie Borough portion of the proposed business park (See BCPC #12203). We would not recommend access be provided onto Tunnel Road until a feasibility analysis has been conducted to evaluate the required improvements and costs, such as right-of-way acquisition, cartway widening, and stormwater management facilities along Tunnel Road, and SEPTA approvals are obtained for crossing their right-of-way with an access drive. If access to Tunnel Road is deemed inappropriate, the township and borough should determine if all buildings can be adequately served by one access point onto Ridge Road.

9. **Natural resource protection standards**—While not a requirement at sketch plan stage, we recommend the plan be revised to include a Natural Resource Protection table that identifies the required versus proposed resource protection ratio. This will ensure that the design and layout of the proposed land development is responsive to the natural resources located on the site.

According to a recent aerial photograph, a significant portion of Proposed Lots 2 and 3 appear to be wooded. Section 27-1900.d of the zoning ordinance requires that no more than 40 percent of the woodland areas within the I-1 and I-2 Industrial districts shall be altered, regraded, cleared or built upon. Section 27-258 defines woodlands as areas comprising of one or more acres of mature or largely mature trees in which the largest trees measure at least 6 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) or 4 ½ feet above the ground. Woodlands are also areas with 10 or more individual trees which measure at least 10 inches dbh and form a continuous canopy. For both sketch plans, future plan submissions should ensure these woodland protection standards are satisfied.

10. **Tree replacement/reforestation**—Section 22-515.7 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires trees of a diameter of 6 inches or more that are removed or destroyed during any stage of development, grading, or construction be replaced with a tree or trees as specified. For both sketch plans, future plan submissions should satisfy this requirement.

11. **Landscaping requirements**—As part of the shared vision for a high-quality business park, the proposed landscaping will play a key role in the overall visual appearance and aesthetics and other environmental benefits such as shade, heat reduction and lower impervious surfaces. While landscaping was not a consideration at sketch plan stage, we recommend future plan submissions for both sketch plans focus on appropriate and effective landscape planting and
buffering. The requirements of Section 22-515.1 related to Street Trees and Buffer Planting, Section 22-515.2 Landscaping of Parking Areas of the subdivision and land development ordinance shall be satisfied.

12. **Stormwater management**—Sketch Plan (East) proposes a stormwater management area and Sketch Plan (West) proposes four separate stormwater management facilities. For both Sketch Plans, future plan submissions are required to satisfy Section 22-516 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, including the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and water quality applications as deemed appropriate.

13. **Parking requirements**—Sketch Plan (West) proposed Use H1 Manufacturing for the 4 separate manufacturing buildings. Use H1 requires one off-street parking space for each employee on the largest shift plus one space for each company vehicle. To ensure excessive parking and impervious surface is not being provided, future plan submissions should ensure that this requirement is being satisfied.

14. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DAS:dc

cc: Robert D. Brink, Pennridge Development Enterprises, Inc.
    Langan
    Marianne Morano, Township Manager (via email)
    Leo Byrne, SEPTA
    Fran Hanney, PennDOT
    Andrea Coaxum, Manager, Perkasie Borough, Adjacent Municipality
MEMORANDUM

TO: East Rockhill Township Board of Supervisors
   East Rockhill Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—Pennridge Airport Corporate Hangar Development
   TMP #12-9-132-1 and -149
   Applicant: Pennridge Development Enterprises, Inc. (c/o Robert D. Brink)
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: November 15, 2016
   Date Received: November 21, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Consolidate five parcels (i.e., TMPs #12-9-132-1, 12-9-149, 33-7-4, 33-7-4-1, and 33-7-5) located within East Rockhill Township and Perkasie Borough into one lot (Proposed Lot 1) totaling 68.164 acres. As part of the airport expansion, construct two, one-story corporate jet hangers totaling 64,800 square feet on a 60.610-acre lot (the portion of Proposed Lot 1 within East Rockhill Township). The airport facility is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: Northwest of Ridge Road, opposite its intersection with Blooming Glen Drive.

Zoning: The I-1 Industrial District permits Use G4 Airport or Heliport by conditional use with a minimum lot area and lot width of 5 acres and 500 feet, respectively.

Present Use: Airport and vacant.

COMMENTS

1. **Lot consolidation**—The plan proposes to consolidate TMPs #12-9-132-1, 12-9-149, 33-7-4, 33-7-4-1, and 33-7-5 located within East Rockhill Township and Perkasie Borough into one lot. According to the Bucks County Board of Assessment (BOA), each tract of land is taxed within its own jurisdiction, so lot consolidation between land within two separate
municipalities is not permitted unless one of the taxing authorities or municipalities provides written documentation to the BOA stating that they authorize the subject land(s) within their jurisdiction to be taxed by the adjoining authority/municipality.

2. **Airport Area Protection Standards**—In the interest of the health, safety, and welfare of those using the airport, Section 27-1600 Airport Area Protection Standards of the zoning ordinance states that hazards that may cause obstructions that cause hazards to air navigation be prevented. The applicant should ensure that the proposed airport expansion satisfies these requirements.

3. **Parking for additional hangers**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-304.G.G4.i (Airport or Heliport) requires off-street parking spaces for principal airport or heliport facility as the Board of Supervisors shall determine adequate to serve customers, patrons, visitors, employees, and vehicles normally parked on the premises. The plan proposes 9 additional hangers; however, no additional parking is proposed. The applicant should provide the township with documentation that additional parking spaces will not be required.

4. **Tree replacement/reforestation**—Section 22-515.7 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires trees of a diameter of 6 inches or more that are removed or destroyed during any stage of development, grading, or construction be replaced with a tree or trees as specified. Future plan submissions should satisfy this requirement.

5. **Tree protection fencing detail**—In order to accommodate Proposed Hangers 6-9, the plan proposes to remove a wooded area near the northwestern perimeter of the site. Sheet CE-101 (Preliminary Soil Erosion Sediment Control Plan) identifies tree protection fencing along the wooded area to remain. Section 22-515.6.E(3) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a 48-inch high snow fence mounted on steel posts, located 8 feet on center or other delineation approved by the township be provided along the boundary of the tree protection zone. Therefore, the plan should be revised to provide a tree protection fencing detail.

6. **Stormwater management**—According to Sheet CG-100, Existing Pond 2 is to be converted from a dry extended detention basin to an infiltration basin, yet the size and volume of the basin appears to remain the same. Based upon the additional impervious surface associated with the 64,800-square-foot hanger expansions, the applicant should provide assurances that the converted infiltration basin will function properly to prevent runoff from exiting the site onto adjacent properties.

While we did not receive a stormwater management plan, the applicant should satisfy Section 22-516 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, including the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and water quality and water volume requirements.

7. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DAS:dc

cc: Robert D. Brink, Pennridge Development Enterprises, Inc.
    Langan
    Marianne Morano, Township Manager (via email)
    Andrea Coaxum, Manager, Perkasie Borough, Adjacent Municipality
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Cam Real Estate Partnership, LP
TMP: #13-47-83-1; -81-1
Applicant: Cam Real Estate Partnership, LP
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: February 13, 2015
Date Received: November 18, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Establish 17 separate lease areas on a 25.4-acre site (TMP #13-47-83-1). Lease areas (L1-L17) range from 1,861 to 229,112.5 square feet. A common area, consisting of 256,707.5 square feet, will provide access to each lease area. Record Plan (2) proposes a separate lease area (L18), consisting of 2.79 acres, on a non-contiguous, nearby site (TMP #13-47-81-1). Existing parking areas will be re-striped. No new construction is proposed. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: On the western side of South Pennsylvania Avenue, south of its intersection with West Post Road.

Zoning: The Riverfront District – 2 (RD2) permits light industrial uses, retail spaces, restaurants, financial establishments, hotels, and open space on lots of a minimum size of four acres. The district permits a maximum building area of 30 percent and a maximum impervious surface ratio of 70 percent.

Present Use: Industrial.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The plans provided indicate that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   - Section 191-8.B To grant both preliminary and final approval.
   - Section 191-31.A To permit no sidewalks or curbing along the property frontage.
   - Section 191-37.B To permit less than 15 feet of open space between the parking area and a building wall.
   - Section 191-37.H To permit no concrete bumper blocks in the parking areas.
   - Section 191-38 To permit no lighting in the parking areas.
   - Section 191-39.G To permit no sidewalks along the property frontage.
   - Section 191-48 To permit no street trees along the street frontage.
   - Section 191-78.C.2 To accept an aerial photograph in lieu of a detailed survey of the property.

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should note all the waivers granted.

2. **Riverfront district**—Section 209-32.4 of the zoning ordinance indicates that the intent of the Riverfront district is to implement the concepts of the Bucks County Waterfront Revitalization Plan, and the Falls Township Comprehensive Plan, as well as to revitalize and redevelop industrial properties. The future land use map of the township’s comprehensive plan indicates that this area southwest of the intersection of Post Road and Pennsylvania Avenue is intended to be developed as single-family dwellings. The Bucks County Waterfront Revitalization Plan also identifies the parcel on Record Plan (1) as an opportunity area to be redeveloped as single-family residences. A stated long term goal of the Bucks County Waterfront Revitalization Plan is to redevelop the area for uses other than industrial, such as residential.

   The Riverfront district appears to have been drafted specifically to implement the Bucks County Waterfront Revitalization Plan, and the majority of the regulations applicable to the Riverfront district are consistent with that plan. However, Sector 2 of the Riverfront district is zoned to permit light industrial uses. There appears to be an inconsistency between the comprehensive plan, the Bucks County Waterfront Revitalization Plan, and the zoning ordinance in that uses which are discouraged (industrial) are expressly permitted by right. We recommend the township review the goals of the comprehensive plan and the Bucks County Waterfront Revitalization Plan and reconsider the permitted uses of the district in light of the stated direction of these land use planning documents.

3. **Pedestrian/bicycle path**—Section 209-32.4.K(2) of the zoning ordinance requires that all properties having frontage along Pennsylvania Avenue provide a pedestrian/bicycle path.
4. **Plan information**—Sheet 4 of 8 indicates a waiver request from the SALDO requirement to provide street trees along Lincoln Highway. The property does not have any frontage along Lincoln Highway.

5. **Sewage facilities**—We recommend that the applicant submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CND:dc

cc:
Cam Real Estate Partnership, LP  
Mark Havers, P.E., Pickering Corts & Summerson  
John Torrenete, Esq., Begley Carlin & Mandio, LLP  
Jim Sullivan, P.E., T & M Associates, Township Engineer  
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)  
Robert C. Sooby, Morrisville Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
   Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—701 Route 113
   TMP #15-8-1
   Applicant: MedExpress Urgent Care MSO, LLC
   Owner: Jeff Greene
   Plan Dated: October 18, 2016
   Date Received: November 28, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 4,714-square-foot medical office building on a 0.62-acre site. The existing restaurant would be removed. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: At the southeast corner of the intersection of County Line Road and Souderton Pike (SR 113).

Zoning: The PC-1 Planned Commercial I District is intended to provide for a wide range of commercial and service type uses. Use D1 Medical Office is a permitted use by right within the PC-1 Planned Commercial District on lots of not less 20,000 square feet.

There are existing nonconformities with respect to the maximum impervious surface and buffer yard width.

Present Use: Eating place.

COMMENTS

1. **Variances**—The site plan indicates that variances are being requested from the zoning ordinance for minimum rear yard setback (Section 160-27), buffer yard requirements (Section 160-33), and sign distance from intersection (Section 160-77.B). We recommend that the plan not be acted upon by township officials until resolution of the request for variance from the Zoning Hearing Board is received.
2. **Parking area location**—Section 160-23.D.(1)(a) of the zoning ordinance requires that all medical office uses shall be located along the front building setback line of the street with all parking placed to the rear of the building(s) so as not to be visible from the street. The plan should be revised to satisfy this requirement.

3. **Building design**—In accordance with Section 160-23.D.(1)(b) of the zoning ordinance, township officials should determine if the bulk, scale, and character of the building would be compatible with the traditional buildings that are characteristic of the rural and historic character of the community, for the Planned Commercial I District. We recommend that the applicant provide architectural renderings for township officials to review.

4. **Souderton Pike (SR 113) driveway**—We recommend that consideration be given to restricting the Souderton Pike driveway movements to right-turn ingress and right-turn egress movements only. Restricting vehicles from turning left onto SR 113 may be beneficial for traffic safety and circulation along the corridor.

5. **Right-only turning lane**—The Traffic Impact Assessment included with the plan indicates that during peak conditions, vehicle queues occur along the through lane approach of County Line Road. We recommend that consideration be given to the construction of a right-only turn lane for vehicles turning onto SR 113 to alleviate congestion within the corridor.

6. **Sidewalks**—Section 140-36 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires sidewalks on both sides of existing streets unless waived by the Board of Supervisors. Sidewalks are not proposed for the site’s frontage along County Line Road.

7. **Invasive exotic plant**—The plant list on Sheet 5 proposes the use of *Pyrus calleryana* (“Redspire” Callery pear). This tree is not included on the official municipal plant list found in Appendix K of the subdivision and land development ordinance. This species and all its cultivars have been classified as an invasive exotic plant in Pennsylvania by the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR). Therefore, we recommend that the plan be revised to provide an appropriate substitution from the township’s plant list.

8. **Parking facilities shading plan**—In accordance with Section 140-37.D.4 of the subdivision and land development ordinance a parking facilities shading plan shall be submitted with any land development application that includes an off-street parking facility.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:jmk

cc: Eric Dietz, MedExpress Urgent Care MSO, LLC  
Todd C. Gittings, K2 Consulting Engineers, Inc.  
Donald Delamater, Township Manager (via email)  
C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer (via email)  
P. Michael Coll, Souderton Borough Manager (adjacent municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Middletown Township Board of Supervisors
   Middletown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for The Marketplace at Oxford Valley, LP
   TMP# 22-40-26-10
   Applicant: The Marketplace at Oxford Valley, LP
   Plan Dated: August 1, 2016
   Last Revised: October 7, 2016
   Date Received: December 1, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 4,500-square-foot commercial building on a pad site (designated as Lot 2) in an existing parking lot within a shopping center. A total of 23 parking spaces is required for the two tenants. Public sewer and water facilities are proposed to serve the building.

Location: South side of Lincoln Highway (U.S. Route 1), across from S. Buckstown Road.

Zoning: The CS Shopping Center District permits retail sales, personal service shops, professional and businesses offices, and banks or similar financial institutions on a minimum lot size of two acres and a lot width of 150 feet. A maximum impervious surface ratio of 60 percent is permissible.

Sheet 5 of the plan indicates that variances were granted pursuant to Resolution No. 16-43 for side yard setback and the required number of parking spaces.

Present Use: Commercial; shopping center.

COMMENTS

1. Waivers—Plan sheet 5 indicates that waivers are requested from required subdivision and land development ordinance provisions regarding building setback from edge of parking (Section 421E.4), curb radius (Section 421E.8) and parking setback from future right-of-way.
(Section 421E.9). Township officials should determine if the waivers should be approved as requested in accordance with Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

2. **Planning module**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposal.

3. **Municipal reference**—Plan Sheet 5, under General Notes 4. Parcel Data, indicates the parcel is located in the Borough of Langhorne instead of Middletown Township. The plan should be revised accordingly.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CIG:dc

cc:  Mark J. Kessler, The Marketplace at Oxford Valley, LP
    Joseph G. Jaworski, P.E., C.M.E., C.F.M., Dynamic Engineering Consultants, PC
    Thomas R. Hecker, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, LLP
    Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer
    Patrick Duffy, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
    Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Middletown Township Board of Supervisors
Middletown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Lot Line Change for 324 and 346 Wyoming Avenue
TMP #22-45-324, -323, -322
Applicant: Joseph Fitch
Owner: Michael and Georgette Hinkson
Plan Dated: May 19, 2016
Date Received: November 16, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide 7,500 square feet from TMP# 22-45-323 (Lot 2) and convey it to neighboring TMP#22-45-324 (Lot 1) to form lots of 23,672 and 17,500 square feet, respectively. Both lots contain existing single-family dwellings. Public water and sewer serve the site and no new development is proposed.

Location: Along the east side of Wyoming Avenue, at its terminus.

Zoning: The R-2 Residence District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet, with a minimum lot width of 80 feet and minimum front yard setback of 25 feet.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENT

- **Zoning table**—We note that it would be beneficial to expand the zoning table by indicating the existing and proposed dimensional and setback information for each lot pursuant to the zoning regulations. Such a table would show existing and proposed zoning compliance in an organized manner.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CIG:dc

cc: Joseph Fitch
    Michael & Georgette Hinkson
    Richard A. Holler, PLS
    Thomas R. Hecker, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, LLP
    Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer
    Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
    Patrick Duffy, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Milford Township Board of Supervisors
   Milford Township Planning Commission
FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission
SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for the Baringer Tract
   TMP #23-15-118 and -118-1
   Applicant: Nappen & Associates
   Owner: Norman L. Baringer
   Plan Dated: November 14, 2016
   Date Received: November 22, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 125,000-square-foot industrial building on a 22.86-acre site (gross). The building is to be used for manufacturing, research, and wholesale/warehouse use. A total of 304 parking spaces are proposed. The site will be served by public water and sewerage.

Location: Southern side of Milford Square Pike, west of the intersection of Milford Square Pike and Portzer Road.

Zoning: The PI Planned Industrial District permits manufacturing, research, and wholesale business/warehouse storage/warehousing uses on a minimum site area of 1 acre with a maximum allowable impervious surface ratio of 60 percent.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

1. **Zoning**—The plan indicates that the site is zoned PI Planned Industrial and includes zoning information for the PI District. However, according to the township’s zoning map, TMP #23-15-118 is zoned PI Planned Industrial and TMP #23-15-118-1 is zoned SRL Suburban Residential Low. Industrial uses are permitted in the PI District but not in the SRL District. While the proposed industrial building is shown within the PI District (TMP #23-15-118), future plan submissions should be revised to identify the area of the site zoned SRL and to include zoning information for the SRL District.
In addition, separate site capacity calculations should be provided for each portion of the site based upon the PI and SRL zoning district boundary. This will ensure that the proposed plan satisfies underlying zoning requirements for the entire site. These calculations should provide impervious surface ratio calculations for all building and parking areas to ensure that the plan satisfies the impervious surface ratio for the PI District.

2. **Airport Zoning Boundary**—The site is adjacent to the Quakertown Airport and is within the Airport Zoning District Boundary regulations as identified in Article VI.C Airport Zoning (Overlay) District of the zoning ordinance. The applicant should determine if the site is within the airport’s transitional zone and, if so, compliance with these requirements should be provided.

3. **Maximum building height**—Section 503 of the zoning ordinance permits a maximum building height of 35 feet in the PI District. Information in the zoning chart indicates that the proposed height (provided) will be greater than 35 feet.

4. **Environmental performance standards**—The site plan shows a watercourse and associated wetlands along the eastern property boundaries. The Site Capacity Calculations indicate that 5.4553 acres of the site are in the floodplain but there are no wetlands identified in table. The calculations, however, identify 1.175 acres of wetland margin area. The site plan does not indicate the location of floodplain boundaries, but instead, identifies a significant area of wetlands and an associated 25-foot-wide wetland margin. According to a notation on the plan, wetlands and alluvial soils were delineated by Del Val Soils & Environmental Consultants in October of 2016.

Also, it is unclear if the watercourse shown on the plan qualifies as an identified waterway requiring the establishment of a Riparian Corridor Conservation District (RCCD). If so, the requirements of Section 650 of the zoning ordinance shall be satisfied. Future plans should be revised to address these issues.

5. **Traffic impact study**—In accordance with Section 701.h.17 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO), a traffic impact study (TIS) is required for land development that could result in traffic generation of 100 or more trips per day. If applicable, a TIS should be submitted at the preliminary plan stage.

6. **Parking**—The sketch plan proposes Uses G1 Manufacturing, G2 Research, and G3 Wholesale Business Wholesale Storage, Warehousing. For all three uses, Section 404 of the zoning ordinance requires one off-street parking space for each employee on largest shift, plus one off-street parking space for each company vehicle normally stored on premises, plus one off-street parking space for every 10 employees on the largest shift for visitor parking. In addition to these requirements, for Uses G1 and G3, the applicant must illustrate on the land development plan that there is sufficient area on-site to accommodate the parking requirement based upon a parking ratio of 1 to 500 square feet of gross floor area. This is to ensure that a sufficient amount of parking can be provided if the use or tenancy changes. In addition, the requirements of Section 517.d must be satisfied, which states that the land development plan shall indicate the maximum impervious surface ratio will be met if the total number of parking spaces is provided.
According to the sketch plan, 118 parking spaces are required and 304 parking spaces would be provided, which is a difference of 186 parking spaces or over 2.5 times the required amount of parking. In order to satisfy the 1 to 500 parking ratio requirement for illustration purposes (noted above), the applicant should identify the portion of the proposed 125,000-square-foot building that will be used for G1 and G3 uses only. Those parking spaces that are intended for illustration purposes shall be clearly labeled on the plan.

In order to reduce the amount of unnecessary impervious surface and parking area, the applicant should justify all parking proposed in addition to the required number of parking spaces.

7. **Buffer yard**—Section 520.c.6(c) of the subdivision and land development ordinance prohibits the location of certain features and activities within the required buffer yard, including structures, parking, and manufacturing or processing activity. The sketch plan shows a portion of the parking lot in front of the building (area containing approximately 18 spaces), a proposed grass emergency access drive, and a portion of the loading area in the rear of the building within the required 100-foot buffer yard. Future plans should be adjusted to comply with this ordinance requirement.

8. **Clear sight triangle**—Section 523.b of the zoning ordinance states that at each point where a private accessway or driveway intersects a public street, a clear sight triangle, measured 10 feet from the point of intersection of the street line and the edge of the accessway, be provided. Future plans should indicate the required clear sight triangles at both driveway entrances, in accordance with the requirement in Section 523.b of the zoning ordinance.

9. **Curbs**—Section 516.b of the SALDO requires curbs to be constructed along abutting streets. Future plan submissions for the development should show curbing along the site’s entire frontage along Milford Square Pike.

10. **Sidewalks**—Section 519.a of the SALDO requires that sidewalks be provided. Future plan submissions for the proposal should indicate the required sidewalks along Milford Square Pike.

11. **Landscaping**—Future plan submissions should show compliance with the street tree planting, parking lot, and buffer landscaping requirements in Sections 520.a, 517.b.17 and 18, and 520.c of the SALDO.

12. **Recreation land and facilities**—Section 525 of the SALDO requires applicants proposing a subdivision or land development to dedicate recreation land and facilities unless the Board of Supervisors determines that a contribution of a fee in lieu is acceptable. Future plan submissions should show compliance with this ordinance requirement.

13. **Drainage easement**—Section 515.e of the SALDO states that where a site is traversed by a watercourse, a drainage easement or right-of-way conforming substantially with the line of such watercourse shall be provided. The required easement should be shown on future plans.

14. **Street and stormwater drainage improvements**—Given the length of the site’s frontage along Milford Square Pike, future plan submissions should ensure that the street improvements requirements in Section 604.d and storm sewerage system requirements in Section 610 of the SALDO are satisfied.
15. **Stormwater management**—The sketch plan identifies one area, behind the proposed building and loading area, for stormwater management facilities. As part of the BMP feasibility analysis required in Section 512 of the SALDO, other BMPs could be employed throughout the site, such as infiltration applications, rain gardens, and vegetative swales. Future plan submissions should satisfy the township’s stormwater management ordinance.

16. **Plan information**—A brief description of the proposal should be submitted with the sketch plan (as recommended in Section 700.b.5 of the SALDO).

17. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LW/DAS:dc

cc: Robert W. Nappen, Nappen & Associates  
    Richard Stoneback, P.E., Charles E. Shoemaker, Inc.  
    Kevin Wolf, P.E., Andersen Engineering, Inc., Township Engineer  
    Jeffrey Vey, Township Manager (via email)  
    Quakertown Area Planning Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
   New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Maxine M. Eagono
   TMP #26-3-114
   Applicant: Maxine M. Eagono
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: October 20, 2016
   Date Received: October 31, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 5.203-acre parcel into four single-family detached dwelling lots and one additional lot (0.94 acre) on the south side of Elaines Lane that will remain undeveloped. Lot 1 would consist of 1.278 acres; Lot 2 would consist of 1.008 acres; Lot 3 would consist of 1.149 acres; Lot 4 would consist of 1.075 acres and contain an existing house that will remain and maintain a nonconforming front yard setback; Lot 5 would consist of 0.94 acre. Dwelling units will be served by public water and sewer.

Location: About 250 feet east of the intersection of New Galena and Peace Valley roads and between New Galena Road and Elaines Lane.

Zoning: RR Residential District permits the B1 Use, single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot size of one acre.

Present Use: Residential

COMMENTS

1. Waivers requested—The applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:
Section 22-706.2.B  Requiring sidewalk installation along the property frontage of every existing street abutting the subdivision.

Section 22-705.3.A  Requiring major collector cartway width to be 48 feet.

Section 22-713.4.A  Requiring street trees to be planted 30 feet along all proposed and existing streets.

Section 22-705.13.B  Requiring to use the road of lesser classification for access where more than one frontage exist.

Section 22-705.13.C  Requiring to improve adjacent existing street to township standards.

Section 22-716.2  Requiring monumentation at the beginning and end of all easements.

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based and the minimum modification necessary. The previous submission listed justification for three waivers requested and additional waivers have been added to the current submission.

2. **Driveway intersections**—SALDO Section 22-705.13.B and C note that driveways should provide access to the existing street of lesser classification. The township should determine if the driveway access to the house on Lot 3 would be better served if it intersected on Elaines Lane rather than New Galena Road. New Galena Road is classified as a major collector street and Elaines Lane appears to be a local drive. The applicant is seeking waivers from SALDO Section 22-705.13.B and C. In addition, the township should verify that the proper stopping area is designed for each proposed driveway intersection.

3. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module ApplicationMailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed five lot subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the current reviews with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

JSI:dc

cc: Maxine M. Eagono  
Erik Garton, P.E., Gilmore & Associates  
Eileen Bradley, Manager, New Britain Township (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Newtown Borough Council  
Newtown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for 223 N. State Street 
TMP #28-2-193-1  
Applicant: Lubavitch Bucks Co. Mikvah Assn.  
Owner: Same  
Plan Dated: October 18, 2016  
Date Received: November 9, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which 
has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 1,773-square-foot building on a 15,000-square-foot lot for use as a mikvah. 
Public water and sewerage facilities are intended.

Location: Eastern side of North State Street, approximately 140 feet north of Jefferson Street.

Zoning: The BR-1 Borough Residential District-1 permits a single-family detached dwelling on a 
minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet.

The submission indicates that the Borough of Newtown Zoning Hearing Board, on August 31, 
2016, granted a variance from zoning ordinance Section 600.A to permit a place of worship 
(mikvah), subject to nine conditions.

Present Use: Residential (to be removed).

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   - **Section 503.F**  
     To permit the proposed grading to be 0.0 feet from the property line.
   - **Section 508.E**  
     To permit a two-way driveway and drive aisle to be 18 feet wide with 90-degree angled parking.
Section 509.G  To permit a 4-foot-wide sidewalk adjacent to parking areas.
Section 606.F.3.c To allow the minimum diameter of a storm drainage pipe to be 8 inches.
Section 702.C.2 To allow a partial waiver to permit an aerial photograph in lieu of requiring the location, names, widths of streets, the location of property lines and names of owners, the location of watercourses, sanitary sewers, storm drains and similar features within 100 feet of any part of the land to be developed.

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based and the minimum modification necessary.

2. **Street trees**—SALDO Section 510.A states that street trees shall be provided and placed behind the right-of-way line of the streets so as to not interfere with the installation and maintenance of sidewalks and utilities, unless otherwise specified by Borough Council. The three proposed *Acer rubrum* (red maple) trees are located within the legal right-of-way of North State Street. The plan should be revised unless the placement in the right-of-way has been specified by Borough Council.

3. **Tree protection**—The tree calculation on Sheet 7 of the plan indicates that no existing trees will be removed, but what appears to be tree protection fencing is not shown around all existing trees that are located near proposed grading. For example, the plan shows an existing 6-inch tree, 2-inch tree, and 6-inch pine in the front yard west of the proposed building, a 12-inch tree and 6-inch pine along the northern lot line, and a 3-inch tree and 6-inch pine along the southeastern lot boundary. We commend the applicant for retaining the existing trees on the site, but the plan should clarify the trees that are to be protected and saved.

4. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dc

     Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Borough Engineer
     Judy Musto, Borough Secretary (via email)
     Jo-Anne Brown, Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
    Northampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Giuliano Family LTD Partnership
         TMP #31-1-8-15
         Applicant: Jerry Giuliano
         Owner: Giuliano Family LTD Partnership
         Plan Dated: November 10, 2016
         Date Received: November 17, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Develop a 200-by-125-foot athletic training field for an existing 5,280-square-foot multisport facility (in a 39,000-square-foot warehouse building) on a 4.193-acre site. The plan proposes to construct a walkway between the facility and the field and to restripe a parking lot to add 25 parking spaces. Public water and sewerage serve the site.

Location: Along the southwest side of Steamwhistle Drive, 500 feet northwest of its intersection with Railroad Drive.

Zoning: The I-1 Planned Industrial/Office District does not permit multisport facilities. Permitted uses require a minimum lot size of 2 acres with a lot width of 200 feet. The Northampton Township Zoning Hearing Board granted variances from the following sections of the zoning ordinance at a meeting held on May 11, 2015:

27-602 To conduct an indoor multisport facility use in the I-1 Planned Industrial/Office District.

27-1110 and 604 To allow 88 off-street parking spaces for a multisport facility and existing industrial use, where 112 are required.
The township zoning hearing board further granted variances from the following sections of the zoning ordinance at a meeting held on June 27, 2016:

27-602 To expand the multisport facility use on the property to allow an accessory outdoor training turf field.

27-1111.E(2) To allow an incident spill light level of up to 1.5 footcandles at the property line.

27-1111.E(3) To allow a mounting height of 40 feet above grade for light fixtures that do not meet IENSA cutoff criteria.

27-1111.E(4) To allow outdoor lighting fixtures to emit light above a horizontal plane passing through the lowest point of the light emitting elements.

Present Use: Manufacturing and warehouse; multisport facility.

COMMENTS

1. **Accessible parking**—The plan shows two accessible parking spaces. Section 22-403.8.B(4)(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires accessible parking spaces for the disabled to be provided pursuant to the Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities, United States Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, as amended, promulgated by the Americans with Disability Act of 1990. The 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design requires five accessible parking spaces, including one van-accessible space, for parking lots that are between 101 and 150 parking spaces.

2. **Stormwater management**—The plan proposes a 25,522-square-foot increase in impervious surface. The plan submission has not included a stormwater management (SWM) site plan to explain how the site’s stormwater runoff will be managed (Section 23-301 of the Stormwater Management and Grading Ordinance).

   Stormwater discharges from the roof of the existing building and proposed playing surface are proposed to flow into an existing swale leading to a neighboring property in Warwick Township (TMP #51-13-65). The township should be assured that the adjacent property owner has been notified in writing regarding any increase stormwater runoff from the site (Section 23-301.7 of the Stormwater Management and Grading Ordinance).

3. **Plan information**—General Note #1 identifies the parcel incorrectly as TMP #31-1-8-14.

4. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.
In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MAR:dc

cc: Jerry Giuliano, Giuliano Family LTD Partnership
    Eric Clase, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
    Mike Solomon, Director of Planning and Zoning, Northampton Township (via email)
    Dave Connell, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Northampton Township Engineer
    Robert Pellegrino, Northampton Township Manager (via email)
    Gail V. Weniger, Manager, Warwick Township (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
    Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Pennridge Airport Business Park
          TMP #33-7-4, -4-1, -5, 33-3-20, -21, 12-9-149, and 12-8-127
          Applicant: Pennridge Development Enterprises, Inc.
          Owner: Same
          Plan Dated: November 11, 2016
          Date Received: November 14, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct 245,700 square feet of nonresidential space in four buildings on two separate tracts. Lot 1 (7.554 acres) is proposed to have a hotel and conference center of 36,000 square feet and a brew pub of 9,700 square feet, plus 2,000 square feet of possible outdoor seating area (11,700 square feet total); and Lot 2 (21.12 acres) is proposed to have two manufacturing buildings of 100,000 square feet each. Public water and sewerage facilities are intended.

Location: The tracts are along the northern side of Ridge Road and the East Rockhill Township boundary. Lot 1 is approximately 1,200 feet west of the existing access driveway to the Pennridge Airport along Ridge Road, and Lot 2 is approximately 400 feet east of the intersection of Ridge Road and Tunnel Road.

Zoning: The I-3 Industrial District permits a range of nonresidential uses including G(4) Manufacturing, E(10) Motel or hotel, and E(21) Brewpub. The minimum lot area is 1 acre in the I-3 District. Minimum lot area is 2 acres for use E(10) Hotel or motel.

Present Use: Vacant.
1. **Lot consolidation**—The plan proposes the consolidation of TMPs #33-7-4, 33-7-4-1, 33-7-5, and 12-9-149 (totaling 89.216 acres) for Lot 1 and the consolidation of TMPs #33-2-21, 33-3-20, and 12-8-127 (totaling 62.755 acres) located within Perkasie Borough and East Rockhill Township for Lot 2. According to the Bucks County Board of Assessment (BOA), each tract of land is taxed within its own jurisdiction, so lot consolidation of land in two separate municipalities is not permitted unless one of the taxing authorities or municipalities provides written documentation to the BOA stating that they authorize the subject land(s) within their jurisdiction can be taxed by the adjoining authority/municipality.

2. **Coordination of development**—As noted in our previous reviews of the proposed rezoning of this tract, Perkasie Borough and East Rockhill Township established a shared vision of creating a high-quality business park within their respective industrial districts adjacent to Pennridge Airport through a cooperative planning effort. This coordinated effort could include a master plan, phasing plan, and amendments necessary to enhance the unification and aesthetics of the business park since the proposed park is located in three separate zoning districts in the two municipalities. Subsequently, Perkasie rezoned its portion of the site independently of East Rockhill and has submitted this preliminary plan, while we recently reviewed a sketch plan for the part of the site in East Rockhill (BCPC #10996-A, December 8, 2016).

We also note that the transportation impact study (TIS) submitted with the preliminary plan in Perkasie includes a sketch plan of the proposed development in East Rockhill, but the preliminary plan submission does not show the sketch layout of the intended development in the township.

We continue to recommend coordination and unification of the design, layout, and aesthetics of the business park in order to achieve the high-quality development that both municipalities envisioned. Other important cooperative concerns include addressing traffic flow and safety along Ridge Road, Tunnel Road, and nearby intersections, providing on-site amenities for business park employees and visitors (e.g., ponds/water features, picnic areas, and benches along with the trails) and marketing the business park to maximize its economic benefits for both municipalities. We recommend that the borough and applicant cooperate with East Rockhill Township in this effort.

3. **Transportation impact study**—The sketch plan in the transportation impact study (TIS) shows a deceleration lane for the site driveway; however, in addition it appears that the volumes would require an exclusive left turn lane for Ridge Road at the site entrance(s). We recommend that the need for a left turn lane be investigated.

4. **Calculations for development outside Perkasie Borough**— Portions of the proposed development (e.g., access drives, stormwater management facilities, etc.) are located in East Rockhill Township. Sheet 5 of 54 shows a Perkasie Borough zoning data table for the portions of the proposal within Perkasie. The plan should include zoning information for the applicable zoning districts in East Rockhill and calculations for the area in the township that is being used for this development, so that compliance with East Rockhill Township’s ordinance requirements can be verified.

---

1 Perkasie Borough’s vision for properties adjacent to Pennridge Airport is established in the *Comprehensive Plan Update (2014)* and East Rockhill Township’s is established in their *Economic Development Initiative (May 2014)*.
5. **Existing woodlands**—The Existing Resource and Site Analysis Map (Sheet 3 of 54) and Existing Aerial Map (Sheet 2 of 54) show existing woodlands on the site, and the Zoning Data Table states the percentage of woodland disturbance for Lots 1 and 2. However, the Zoning Data Table does not indicate the amount of existing woodlands or the amount proposed to be disturbed, so that the borough can verify compliance with the 70 percent maximum woodland disturbance in the I-3 District required by zoning ordinance Section 186-20.L(4)(a).

It is unclear whether the proposed woodlands removal of 68 percent for Lot 1 and 65 percent for Lot 2 include the area of the reserved parking or the area of woodlands disturbed by utility installation (see Comment 11). The plan should be revised to clarify that information.

Zoning ordinance Section 186-20.L(4)(a) also states that Borough Council may, at its sole discretion, as part of the subdivision and land development process, authorize a further reduction or elimination of the woodland protection ratio on the property in exchange for the applicant installing a replacement tree for every tree removed over the permitted 70 percent woodland disturbance or make a contribution to the borough to plant replacement trees elsewhere in the borough. In order for borough to determine the number of replacement trees or a fee in lieu that may be necessary, the plan must state the amount of existing woodlands and the amount of woodlands proposed to be disturbed, both initially and in the future.

6. **Steep slopes**—The plan’s Existing Resource and Site Analysis Map (Sheet 3 of 54) includes a steep slopes table that is incomplete and needs clarification. The table indicates the existing amount of steep slopes in the various categories, but it does not indicate the amount of steep slopes in each category proposed to be disturbed and the amount that will permanently remain undisturbed. In addition, it is unclear where the tones for the three categories of slopes appear on the plan. It is also unclear what the left-most column in the table, with the heading, “Number” and the numerals 1, 2, and 3 refers to. The plan should be revised accordingly.

7. **Impervious surface**—The Perkasie Borough Zoning Data Table on Sheet 5 of 54 should be clarified to indicate whether the proposed impervious cover of 53 percent on Lot 1 and 54 percent on Lot 2 include the area of reserved parking.

8. **Parking amount**—The plan should provide parking calculations demonstrating compliance with the requirements of zoning ordinance Section 186-61.

a. **Manufacturing**—Sheet 8 of 54 shows the number of parking spaces proposed for Manufacturing Building 1 and Sheet 7 of 54 shows the number of parking spaces proposed for Manufacturing Building 2, but the plan should provide a calculation of how those figures were derived, based on the parking requirement of zoning ordinance Section 186-20.L(3)(a)(i), which requires one off-street parking space for every 1,000 square feet of gross floor area for a manufacturing use. We also note that the plan indicates 100 parking spaces proposed per building, but 99 spaces are shown for each building.

b. **Hotel and conference center**—The plan shows 130 parking spaces and 36 reserved spaces for the proposed hotel and conference center, but it does not provide calculations for how the amount of required parking was determined. Section 186-61.C(5)(j) requires one off-street parking space for each rental room or suite, plus one additional space for each full-time employee. The use regulations for Use E(10) Hotel or motel in Section E(10)(f) of the zoning ordinance state that eating places and conference and meeting rooms shall be permitted only as accessory uses to a motel or hotel. The applicant should
provide information regarding the square footage that will be devoted to use as a conference center in order to determine the appropriate amount of parking in addition to what is required for the rental rooms and employees.

c. **Brewpub**—The plan shows 70 parking spaces proposed for the brewpub, but it does not indicate how the amount of parking was calculated. We note that Section 186-61 of the zoning ordinance does not include a parking requirement for Use E (21) Brewpub. Determining the appropriate amount of parking should take into account the needs of the beer production facilities as well as the eating and drinking facilities. In addition to the 9,700 square feet of building area, the plan shows a possible outdoor seating area of 2,000 square feet. The parking calculation should take into account the total indoor and outdoor square footage for the use.

d. **Reduced parking ratio**—We note that Section 186-20.L(3)(b) of the zoning ordinance states that Borough Council may, in its sole discretion and as part of the subdivision/land development approval process, reduce the required parking based on a parking study prepared by an appropriate professional. The study shall demonstrate that the proposed parking supply will be adequate to serve the parking needs of the proposed use. If the necessary parking calculations as noted above show that the required amount of parking is not being provided, the required parking study should be provided by the applicant so that Borough Council can evaluate whether the parking needs of the proposed uses will be adequately served.

9. **Reserved parking**—The plan proposes a total of 94 reserved parking spaces: 20 reserved parking spaces for Manufacturing Building 1, 38 reserved spaces for Manufacturing Building 2, and 36 reserved spaces for the hotel and conference center. Zoning ordinance Section 186-20.L(3)(b) states that Borough Council may, at its sole discretion, permit shared and/or reserved parking in the I-3 District. Borough Council should determine if the proposed reserved parking is acceptable.

10. **Outdoor dining area**—Section 186-18.E(21) of the zoning ordinance states that, for a brewpub, outdoor dining area shall be in accordance with outdoor dining standards. The borough's zoning and subdivision and land development ordinances do not include outdoor dining standards. Outdoor dining issues should be resolved during preliminary plan review, such as whether amplified music or sound is permitted, whether to prohibit the carrying of open containers of alcoholic beverages outside the delineated food service area, whether to permit outdoor food preparation or outdoor bars or table service only, or other issues that may impact adjacent neighbors or other users of the site, such as hotel guests.

We also recommend that the borough adopt outdoor dining standards. Outdoor dining is a popular feature that could contribute to the vibrancy of the Town Center and other existing commercial centers. Additionally, three of the uses recently added to the zoning ordinance state that outdoor dining area shall be in accordance with outdoor dining standards, but the borough has no such standards.

11. **Underground electric line**—Sheet 27 of 54 shows a line near the northeastern corner of Manufacturing Building 2 that is labelled “UE” and noted on Sheet 44 of 54 as underground electric (not identified in the legend). The proposed UE line extends beyond the limit of disturbance, through a wooded area, and connects to an existing utility pole along the unpaved access road. The plan should provide tree protection fencing along the area of proposed grading and construction equipment intrusion in the wooded area to preserve the tree protection zone, as
required by Section 186-5 of the zoning ordinance and Sections 164-141.1 and 164-68.D.17 and 18 of the subdivision and land development ordinance. The amount of woodlands to be removed for installation of the utility line should be accounted for in the woodlands calculation in the zoning data table on Sheet 5.

12. **Airport hazard regulations**—The applicant should ensure that the proposed development complies with the airport hazard regulations of zoning ordinance Section 186-130 in order to prevent obstructions that may cause hazards to air navigation.

13. **Architectural composition**—To promote the high-quality business park ideal discussed in the *Perkasie Borough Comprehensive Plan Update*, the borough and applicant may wish to discuss a preferred architectural appearance with elements and features that will provide aesthetics and will assist in unifying the overall appearance of the buildings throughout the site and including the future development planned in East Rockhill Township. For instance, to discourage large, rectangular, mass-produced looking buildings, techniques such as modulation and articulation (vertical and horizontal staggering/setback) can be incorporated into the walls and facades to help break up a building’s mass and monotonous appearance. Also, architectural elements such as roof styles and materials may provide visual interest and uniformity throughout the business park.

14. **Water volumes**—According to subdivision and land development ordinance Section 164-68.D.23, the preliminary plan must state the estimated average and peak volumes of water needed to serve the proposed land development. An indication of the available water for fire flow and the water volume required to satisfy the Insurance Services Office (ISO) standards for fire protection also should be provided.

15. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dc

cc: Robert Brink, Pennridge Development Enterprises, Inc.
Langan
Erik Garton, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
Marianne K. Morano, Manager, East Rockhill Township (Adjacent Municipality) (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Valley Square Phase I
TMP # 50-32-51
Applicant: iStar Harrisburg Business Trust
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: November 8, 2016
Date Received: November 18, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct 38,300 total square feet of commercial space comprising 7 buildings with the following uses and sizes on a 13.45-acre site:

Retail buildings: 3,500, 6,000, 7,700, and 7,700 square feet
Restaurant with drive-through: 3,300 square feet
Bank: 3,000 square feet
Office: 7,100 square feet

Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: Northeastern corner of the intersection of Street (SR 132) and Easton (SR 611) roads.

Zoning: CBD Central Business District permits professional and business offices, retail businesses and services, financial institutions, and age-restricted residential uses. Conditional uses include hotel/motel and retail commercial on lots of 5 acres or more. The site may be developed for mixed-use development with a minimum of three different uses. No one use shall occupy more than 60 percent of gross site area.

Present Use: Vacant.
COMMENTS

1. **Design issues**

   a. **Main Street focus**—The site abuts The Shops at Valley Square which is an outdoor lifestyle shopping center with buildings clustered along Main Street with street side parking and parking lots in the rear of the buildings. The focus of activity on the site is inward along Main Street. This design makes Valley Square different and unique compared to other nearby shopping centers. We believe that integrating the proposed development with this established destination center would be mutually beneficial to the existing and proposed businesses.

   Main Street passes through the subject site but the proposed development has no relationship to it. The proposed buildings are spread out over the entire site with parking lots between them. The access points to Easton and Street roads promote an outward focus typical of a strip commercial center. We acknowledge a previous plan which contains the same access points, but we believe that these accesses detract from the function and character of the site and the integrity and character of the adjacent Shops at Valley Square, and impede traffic flow on Easton and Street roads.

   The site has frontage on Street and Easton roads which a major entry to Warrington. This site is the front door for Valley Square and should be designed to complement the entire Valley Square site and enhance the intersection. We recommend that the plan be revised to cluster the proposed buildings along Main Street and provide a parallel loop road through the site. Elimination of the access points to Street and Easton road and clustering the buildings would mimic The Shops at Valley Square. Strategic landscaping and civic space should be provided where appropriate. This design would better integrate development on this site with Valley Square. The small portion of the site north of Main Street may be enhanced with amenities such as benches and landscaping to complement buildings on the southern side.

   Improvements such as landscaped berms and a short wall along the Street and Easton road frontages would beautify the intersection and soften the appearance of the parking lots.

   To illustrate some of these ideas, we have included a conceptual sketch diagram. (See attachment.)

   b. **Parking vs circulation**—There is no main circulation drive through the site. All of the vehicular drives on the site are also parking aisles. Vehicles maneuvering in and out of the parking spaces will conflict with through traffic. We recommend that the site circulation and parking be redesigned to provide a distinction between the two functions to provide safer and more effective access. A loop road south of Main Street connecting with it on the east and west side of the site.

   c. **Sidewalks**—Section 1605.3.A of the zoning ordinance requires that sidewalks be provided along both sides of all internal streets between the buildings in the development, between buildings and parking, plazas or open areas and off-site destination points. The plan shows a sidewalk along the perimeter of the site which connects with existing Shops at Valley Square and on one side along the Main Street drive. These sidewalks do not connect with the proposed buildings. The site is small
enough that walking is feasible between the proposed buildings and the Shops at Valley Square.

There are also no sidewalks through the parking lot so site users will have to walk among moving cars to access the retail buildings. The size of the parking lot and lack of pedestrian facilities through the site may also make it difficult for parents with children and the elderly to move from their vehicles to the retail buildings. The plan should be revised to show sidewalks along both sides of Main Street and between the perimeter sidewalk and proposed buildings.

d. **Corridor Overlay district**—Section 1605.3 of the zoning ordinance provides for a review process for architectural and site development design for development in the Route 611 corridor. The applicant should submit architectural drawings and photos of the site at the preliminary plan stage and adhere to the design standards for the district.

2. **Transportation issues**

a. **Traffic Impact Study**—Section 2503.1 of the zoning ordinance requires a traffic impact study for all subdivisions and/or land developments for all commercial or industrial applications. The original Valley Square plan submission contained a traffic impact study which may be revised to address the proposed development. Therefore, we recommend that a traffic impact study be provided so that all reviewing agencies have an opportunity to comment on transportation issues for the proposed land development.

b. **Site access**—Section 1605.A of the zoning ordinance requires that all uses within a business campus or mixed-use development shall take access from an interior roadway or common access driveway. The plan shows access to the site from Main Street which connects with Valley Square Boulevard; however, access to Street and Easton roads is also provided.

The proposed access drive to the site from Street Road permits turns from eastbound Street Road which will cross the westbound lanes and may create conflicts. This access serves as direct access to the center of Phase I but appears to be redundant because the site is served by an access adjacent to Building 15 and Valley Square Boulevard via Main Street. We recommend that the access be eliminated or revised to be a right-in only or right-in/right-out access to eliminate turning maneuvers across westbound Street Road.

The applicant also should investigate eliminating access on Easton Road due to the proximity to the existing signal at Street Road, and the need for vehicles turning north on Easton Road from Street Road to change lanes rapidly to access the proposed driveway.

c. **Public transportation**—The site abuts Easton Road, which is served by SEPTA bus service. Development on the site has the potential to generate transit trips by both employees and shoppers. We recommend that the developer work with SEPTA to determine an appropriate location for a bus shelter on-site.
3. **Environmental study**—Tax map parcel #50-32-51 was once the location of a gasoline station. It is not clear if the underground tanks have been removed or if groundwater contamination exists. It should be determined whether a Phase 1 environmental study is necessary.

4. **Tree removal**—Zoning ordinance Section 2322.1, Trees on Wooded Lots, requires that no live trees of a diameter greater than 10 inches measured at a point of four feet above grade be removed in connection with a land development or building permit unless a zoning permit for a specific number of trees is obtained from the Zoning Officer upon recommendation by the Planning Commission. In no case will removal of trees exceed the standards for woodland protection. The site contains several trees of a caliper greater than 15 inches including a 21-inch oak and 30-inch maple. If it is determined that these trees cannot be saved on future plans a permit should be requested for their removal.

5. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017 public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dc

cc: Donna Musial, iStar Harrisburg Business Trust  
Thomas Hanna, P.E., Gilmore & Associates  
William Benner, Esq., Benner & Wild  
Tom Zarko, P.E., CKS Engineers, Municipal Engineer  
Barry Luber, Township Manager (via email)  
Roy Rieder, Director of Planning and Special Projects (via email)
Attachment: Conceptual Sketch Diagram
MEMORANDUM

TO: Wrightstown Township Board of Supervisors
Wrightstown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of 2629 Windy Bush Road
TMP #53-2-103-2
Applicant: Michael & Rita Iorio
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: November 14, 2016
Date Received: November 15, 2016

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 10.02-acre site into three residential lots. An existing single-family dwelling, pool and two barns will remain on Lot 1, which will be 348,366 square feet and continue to have access from Windy Bush Road. Lots 2 and 3 will each be 43,560 square feet (1 acre) and will each contain a proposed single-family dwelling with access from Jericho Valley Road. Individual on-lot water and sewage facilities will serve the site.

Location: The parcel has access to both Jericho Valley Road and Windy Bush Road. The access from Windy Bush Road is located approximately 700 feet northeast of the intersection of Windy Bush and Durham roads. The access from Jericho Valley Road is located approximately 960 feet east from the intersection of Jericho Valley Road and Windy Bush Road.

Zoning: The parcel is zoned CR-I Country Residential/Low Density District which permits single-family detached dwellings with a minimum lot area of 1 acre.

Present Use: Residential.
COMMENTS

1. **Curbs and sidewalks**—Township officials should determine if curbs and sidewalks should be provided along Windy Bush Road on future plan submissions in accordance with Sections 22-520.1 and 22-520.6 of the subdivision and land development ordinance. While there are no sidewalks along Jericho Valley Road and Windy Bush Road in proximity to the subject site, we note that the site is across from the Anchor Crossing shopping center and less than a quarter of a mile from the commercial and office uses at the intersection of Windy Bush Road and Route 413. Curbs have not been provided along Jericho Valley Road and Windy Bush Road, although drainage swales have been provided for storm drainage.

2. **Setbacks**—The setback lines for Lot 1 should be shown on the plan in accordance with Section 22-4074.B.(16)(b) of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

3. **Clear sight triangles**—Clear sight triangles are required by Section 22-524.1.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

4. **Park and recreation land**—The applicant should indicate how the park and recreation land requirement of Section 22-531.1.B(1)(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance will be met.

5. **References to Wrightstown Township**—The applicant should ensure that the submission refers to Wrightstown Township throughout the submission. The stormwater management plan includes references to Newtown Township on pages 1, 5, and 7. On the post-construction management plan (Sheet 9) a reference to Warminster Township is in the design engineer certification block.

6. **Aerial photo legibility**—We recommend that subsequent submittals include a clearer image for the aerial photographs on Sheets 1 and 2. Our copies of the submittal where difficult to read due to a darkened image.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 4, 2017 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:dc

cc: Michael and Rita Iorio
Robert Cunningham, P.E., Holmes Cunningham, LLC
John VanLuvanee, Esq., Eastburn & Gray
Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Township Engineer
Joe Pantano, Township Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>Addisville Commons, Phase 2</td>
<td>12211</td>
<td>31-9-2-8, 31-18-7, -8, -9, -10, -11, -12 &amp; -14</td>
<td>1-09937-409-3J</td>
<td>0201-60046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Makefield Township</td>
<td>Yates Preserve</td>
<td>11453</td>
<td>47-8-19-1</td>
<td>1-09948-346-2</td>
<td>0201-60040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Township</td>
<td>Enclave at Town's Edge</td>
<td>7150-A</td>
<td>9-9-58</td>
<td>1-09919-332-3J</td>
<td>0201-60045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 12, 2016

Mr. James Matticola, P.E.
Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
65 East Butler Avenue
Suite 100
New Britain, PA 18901

RE: Addisville Commons, Phase 2
PaDEP Code # 1-09937-409-3J
BCPC #12211
SLD #15-10
TMPs #31-9-2-8; 31-18-7, -8, -9, -10, -11, -12, and -14
Northampton Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Matticola:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) concerning the proposal to construct five commercial buildings on an 11.55-acre site (Phase 2). Sewage planning was waived for Phase 1 (a 14,578-square-foot pharmacy) on September 4, 2015. Uses and building areas for Phase 2 will consist of:

- 13,500-square-foot retail strip center and restaurant;
- 20,000-square-foot medical office;
- 8,000-square-foot retail use and restaurant;
- 28,000-square-foot retail use, restaurant (2), and gym; and
- 2,600-square-foot bank.

The project (Phase 1 and 2) will be credited with 10 EDUs based on the site’s previous uses. New wastewater flows from Phase 2 (14,476 gallons per day or 63 EDUs) will flow by public sewer through the Northampton, Bucks County, Municipal Authority’s (NBCMA) collection system, through the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCWSA) system, and to the Philadelphia Water Department’s (PWD) Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant via the Neshaminy Interceptor.

---

\(^{1}\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
Mr. James Matticola, P.E.
December 12, 2016
Page 2

The Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970 is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Northampton Township. The proposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area to be served by public sewers.

The NBCMA and BCWSA certify that they have sanitary sewer collection capacity. The PWD certifies there is adequate capacity within the City of Philadelphia’s conveyance and treatment facilities to receive and treat the sewage flows. The waste load will not create a hydraulic or organic overload or a five-year protected overload that is inconsistent with the city’s approved Combined Sewer Overflow Plan.

Component 3, Section G.4. Wetland Protection, indicates that there are wetlands in the area and the project proposes construction activities, encroachments, or obstructions in, along or through wetlands. The project narrative indicates that the wetlands will remain undisturbed, with the exception of a roadway crossing for a connector road. The narrative does not indicate whether a General Permit or full encroachment permit will be required.

The County Planning Review Agency Component 4B is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, PADEP, Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Roadig
Senior Planner

MAR:dc

cc:   Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department
       Genevie Kostick, BCDH
       Dave Connell, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc.
       Mike Solomon, Township Director of Planning and Zoning
       Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
       Act 537 file
**SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE**  
**COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW**  
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this **Planning Agency Review Component** should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

### SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

**Project Name**  
Addisville Commons, Phase 2

### SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **October 17, 2016**

2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction  
   **Agency name**

3. Date review completed by agency

### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>If yes, describe impact <strong>See attached letter.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>If yes, describe impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-1-
SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)

☐ ☐ 11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A

☐ ☑ 12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?

☐ ☐ 13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A

If no, describe which requirements are not met

☐ ☑ 14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?

If no, describe inconsistency

☐ ☑ 15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?

If yes, describe

☐ ☑ 16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?

If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.

If no, describe the inconsistencies N/A

☐ ☑ 17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?

If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?

Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: Michael Roedig
Title: Senior Planner
Signature: [Signature]
Date: [Date]

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission
Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901
Telephone Number: 215 345-3400

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
December 2, 2016

Ms. Jamie Sundermier
Soil Scientist
DelVal Soil & Environmental Consultants, Inc.
4060 Skyron Drive, Sky Run II, Suite A1
Doylestown, PA 18901

RE: Yates Preserve Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09948-346-2
BCPC #11453
TMP #47-8-19-1
Upper Makefield Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Ms. Sundermier:

We have received a copy of the planning module regarding the removal of an existing tenant house and the construction of a 4-bedroom home, pool with pool house containing a convenience bathroom, and a 2-bedroom apartment. According to the Project Narrative, the proposed method of sewage disposal for this proposed facility is a community on-lot sewage disposal system. The projected sewage flow for the proposed facility is 1,000 gallons per day (gpd) of sewage (3 EDUs) based upon a sewage flow of 500 gpd for the 4-bedroom home, 400 gpd for the 2-bedroom apartment, and 100 gpd for the pool house. The existing on-lot private well will serve the site.

The Township of Upper Makefield, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan Update is the official Act 537 Plan for Upper Makefield Township. The proposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area intended to be served by on-lot sewage disposal systems. Given that the soils on the project site were determined to be suitable to support a community subsurface sewage disposal system and that the proposal is consistent with municipal and state planning for the area, other sewage disposal alternatives were not explored.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to the PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 2 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCDH and BCPC review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

---

1 Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Upper Makefield Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Paul W. Gordon
Planner

PWG:dc

Attachment

cc:  Genevie Kostick, BCDH
     Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
     David Nyman, Upper Makefield Township Interim Manager
     Act 537 file
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
BUREAU OF WATER STANDARDS AND FACILITY REGULATION

SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE
COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Lot 1 - Yates Preserve

SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. November 16, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency December 2, 2016

SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

Yes No
1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)? 
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met
2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?
3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
   If no, describe inconsistency
4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
   If no, describe inconsistency
5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
   If no, describe inconsistencies:
6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
   If yes, describe impact
7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?
   If yes, describe impacts
8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?
9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?
10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?
    If no, describe inconsistencies N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>considered by the municipality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances. N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: Paul Gordon
Title: Planner
Signature: 
Date: December 2, 2016

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission
Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901
Telephone Number: 215 345-3400

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
December 16, 2016

James Matticola, P.E.
Gilmore and Associates Inc.
350 E. Butler Ave.
New Britain, PA 18901

RE: Enclave at Town’s Edge Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09919-332-3J
BCPC #7150-A
TMP # 9-9-58
Doylestown Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Matticola:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\(^1\) regarding the proposal for a 12-unit condominium development in a single building to be connected to public sewer service. Wastewater flows, totaling 2,500 gallons per day (10 EDUs), will be conveyed via the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority’s (BCWSA) Castle Valley Interceptor and treated at BCWSA’s King’s Plaza Wastewater Treatment Plant in Doylestown.

The *Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan for Doylestown Township* (Revised December 1999) is the official Act 537 Plan for the Township. The proposal to connect to the public sewerage system is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area to be served by public sewers.

The proposal indicates that the existing single-family home is to be removed and the barn is to remain. The packet included copies of the completed Cultural Resources Notice and a return receipt for its submission to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC), but no review letter from the PHMC was included in the submission to our offices.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to the PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3, and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCDH and BCPC review

---

\(^1\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Doylestown Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Catherine Irving Gauthier
Planner

CIG:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Stephanie Mason, Township Manager
    Act 537 file
Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

**SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)**

Project Name
Enclave at Town's Edge

**SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)**

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. December 9, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency

**SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>If yes, describe impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>If yes, describe impacts See attached letter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances, N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name: Catherine Irving Gauthier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Planner</td>
<td>Signature: Catherine Irving Gauthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 12/10/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address: 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Number: 215 345-3400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS** (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.